

The Hispanic American Historical Review

Vol. XIV

February, 1934

No. 1

JEFFERSONIAN ORIGINS OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

The circumstances which led to the enunciation of the principles of foreign policy contained in President Monroe's famous message of December 2, 1823, and the ideological antecedents of those principles, have been of the greatest historical interest and have consequently been made the subjects of a voluminous literature. The principles are generally considered to be the fruit of a half-century of American experience in the conduct of foreign affairs, ripened into a doctrine in due season when the position, the interest, and the sentiment of the United States had become favorable. In considering the immediate origins of the doctrine, therefore, there has been a tendency to emphasize the circumstances which led to its promulgation to the neglect of the intellectual processes by which the doctrine came to take the exact form that it did and particularly to the neglect of the contributions made by the several statesmen involved to the sense of the final form. From this angle, further light can still be shed on the origins of the Monroe Doctrine.

In evaluating the relative parts played, in the formulation of the Monroe Doctrine, by John Quincy Adams, the staunch New Englander in the department of state, and by the three Virginians, Monroe, Jefferson, and Madison, each on his own hill-top pondering the momentous question presented by the overtures of the British foreign secretary, the former has been given chief credit. Adams has had able champions,

though none more able than himself.¹ The influence of Jefferson, on the other hand, has not been sufficiently appreciated.

The essential principles of the Monroe Doctrine are found, as is well known, in two different parts of the presidential message of December 2, 1823. In the first part of the message is found the principle that colonization in America must cease. For this principle Adams is unquestionably responsible. The more general principles, embodying the doctrine of two spheres of political action, one exclusively European and the other exclusively American, occur in the latter part of the message, and there is reason to think that these are derived from the thought of Thomas Jefferson more than from any other source.

Non-intervention by the United States in European affairs had been a cardinal principle of American foreign policy from the first,² and Jefferson had always drawn a line of distinction between the political interests of Europe and those of America. Thomas Paine, in his *Common Sense*, was probably the first to state the principle explicitly when he said: "It is to the true interest of America to steer clear of European contentions." This principle was immediately adopted as a political maxim of which Jefferson became a principal exponent. It formed the first tenet in his American system of policy, to which he gradually added the supplementary principle that Europe must keep out of America. In various of his letters

¹ The *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, Charles Francis Adams, ed. (12 vols.; Philadelphia, 1874-77) have been the chief source used in ascertaining the personal element in the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine. The thesis that Adams was mainly responsible for the doctrine was first advanced by Worthington C. Ford in his presentation on the "Genesis of the Monroe Doctrine", *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* (January, 1902), 2d series, XV. 373-437, and elaborated in his articles on "John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine", in the *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VII. 676-696, VIII. 28-52.

² See J. Fred Rippy and Angie Debo, "The Historical Background of the American Policy of Isolation", *Smith College Studies in History* (April-July, 1924), IX. Nos. 3 and 4, 75-165, a study which contains an account of the evolution of that policy from 1775 to the issuance of the neutrality proclamation in 1793.

one finds in embryo the doctrine of two spheres.³ Jefferson's ideas, so long in germinating, did not fully emerge, however, until his final retirement to Monticello. Coming to his Virginia estate in the spring of 1809, a white-haired man of sixty-three years, to escape the turmoil of political life, Jefferson became more concerned with broad outlines of American policy than with its intricate details. Having no longer an active share in the direction of foreign relations, his knowledge of them was gleaned from the *Richmond Enquirer*, which was the only newspaper that he took,⁴ from such books on the foreign situation as came to his hands, and from such contacts as he had with men of affairs through their letters to him and through their occasional visits to Monticello.

Among the intellectual influences which served to crystallize Jefferson's ideas on a peculiar American policy into the doctrine of two spheres, the writings of a second-rate French publicist, upon whom Jefferson lavished some of his inexhaustible interest, must hold first place.

Early in 1819, almost five years before the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine, a Frenchman formulated, in words as clear and definite as those of the document itself, its two fundamental principles, predicting that they would form the basis of an American system of policy, clearly distinct from that of the old world. The Abbé Dominique-Georges-Frédéric de Riom de Prolhiac de Fourt de Pradt,⁵ as prolific in writings

³ Gilbert Chinard, *Thomas Jefferson, the Apostle of Americanism* (Boston, 1929), gives a valuable discussion of Jefferson and the doctrine of the two spheres in the chapter entitled "America has a Hemisphere". Note especially the letters of Jefferson to W. C. C. Claiborne, October 29, 1808; *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Memorial edition, Washington, 1903-1904, hereafter cited as *Jefferson, Writings*), XII. 186; and Jefferson to Humboldt, December 6, 1813, *ibid.*, XIV. 20-25.

⁴ George Ticknor to William H. Prescott, December 16, 1824; *Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor* (2 vols.; London, 1876), I. 349.

⁵ For a sketch of Pradt's life see Daupeyroux, "La curieuse vie de l'abbé de Pradt", *Revue des études historiques*, XCV. 279-312, or *Nouvelle biographie générale* (46 vols.; Paris, 1851-1866), XL. 970-973, or *Biographie universelle, ancienne et moderne* (rev. ed., 45 vols.; Paris, 1853-1866), XXXIV. 278-282.

as he is well-supplied with names, developed his ideas of American policy in a series of some fourteen books on American affairs published from 1817 to 1828.⁶ A number of these are known to have engaged the attention of Thomas Jefferson. The first, entitled *Des Colonies et de la Révolution actuelle de l'Amérique*, Jefferson found both "eloquent" and "ingenious".⁷ The most significant, however, from the standpoint of its influence upon Jefferson, was his *L'Europe après le Congrès d'Aix-la-Chapelle, faisant suite au Congrès de Vienne*, which appeared in 1819. Another of his books, *L'Europe et l'Amérique en 1821*, published in 1822, was also in the possession of Jefferson.⁸

In all these books, Pradt emphasized the importance of new world movements, the clear line of cleavage between the new world and the old, and the opposing political systems of the two. In his *L'Europe et l'Amérique en 1821*, in which he devoted a whole section to a discussion of purely American affairs, he wrote:

I have for a long time, drawn the attention to, and shewn the world on the other side of the Atlantic in opposition to Europe, and forming to itself a system, from which a contrast to the institutions, by which Europe is governed, will result, which must attract the observation of every one.⁹

Jefferson, ever sympathetic toward French political thought, was made acquainted with Pradt's *L'Europe après le Congrès d'Aix-la-Chapelle* by its translator.¹⁰ In 1820, the

⁶ See Joseph Sabin, *Dictionary of Books Relating to America* (19 vols.; New York, 1885-), XV, 390-393.

⁷ Jefferson to John Quincy Adams, November 1, 1817; Jefferson, *Writings*, XV, 144-150.

⁸ See *A Catalogue of President Jefferson's Library*, Nathaniel P. Poor, ed. (Washington, 1829).

⁹ *Europe and America in 1821*. Tr. by J. D. Williams (2 vols.; London, 1822), II, 151.

¹⁰ Copies of this translation were also presented to John Quincy Adams (Adams, *Memoirs*, V, 14), and to Madison (Otis to Madison, June 20, 1820; Madison MSS. in Library of Congress). The immediate effect of the book upon Adams and Madison is not apparent from their writings. Adams impatiently

year after the appearance of the French edition, an English translation by George Alexander Otis was published at Philadelphia.¹¹ The book, through its discussion of the European congress that coincidentally defined the principles of the concert of powers and illustrated its attitude toward American affairs, seems to have profoundly influenced Jefferson's conception of the political system of the old world. Its ideas as to American policy seem also to have made a definite impression. In it, Pradt wrote:

There arises beyond the sea, as did Carthage opposite to Rome, a power which tends to form *an American system*; exclusive of all European influence. This system is evidently that of the *United States*. It cannot fail to become that also of all the states, which strive to form themselves throughout the extent of this country. This plan leads America to two things. 1. To abstain from all participation in the affairs of Europe. 2. To prohibit Europe all participation in the affairs of America. This is a primary, elementary datum, destined to form the basis of American policy, and to keep it separate from that of Europe. It consists in reciprocity of independence; and merely signifies the intention to abstain, that others may abstain; to respect, in order to be respected in turn. . . . It is evident that this aversion from all participation with European policy is an axiom for the United States, and is destined to become that of all America.¹²

dismissed Otis, who kept him for two hours in March, 1820, talking of his translation, as a ravenous office-hunter (Adams, *Memoirs*, V. 23-24). For Madison's reaction see Madison to La Fayette, 1821; *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison* (4 vols.; New York, 1884), III. 237-240.

¹¹ Otis was author of numerous Latin, French, and Italian translations, of which the best known is Botta's *History of the War of the Independence of the United States of America* (3 vols.; Philadelphia, 1820-1821), running through twelve editions. In its publication he was encouraged by James Madison, John Quincy Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and others. He wrote: "The subject of History has appealed to me from youth upwards, the most useful as well as delightful branch of literature".—Otis to Jefferson, January 4, 1821; Jefferson MSS. (In Library of Congress). See *N. E. Hist. and Gen. Register*, IV. 151, for notes on Otis.

¹² Abbé de Pradt, *Europe after the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, Forming the Sequel to the Congress of Vienna*. Tr. by George Alexander Otis (Philadelphia, 1820), pp. 203-205. Italics by translator. In support of these views as to American policy, Pradt cited in the French edition an unsigned editorial of an

It is, of course, impossible to establish with certainty the extent and manner of Pradt's influence upon Jefferson, and yet this influence is as probable as it has been unsuspected. Jefferson's interest in Pradt's books, and his tendency, quite natural in itself, to attach importance to those writings that confirmed his views, make Pradt's penetrating delineation of an American system an influence that must be taken into account.

Jefferson, as already noted, had long recognized the first of the principles stated by Pradt that America should abstain from all participation in the affairs of Europe. Various causes made it natural and inevitable that the converse of this policy—of European non-intervention in America—should develop.¹³ It was necessary, however, to formulate and state this supplementary principle, the principle that it was the natural province of the United States, as the leading American power, to keep Europe from interfering in the affairs of America. Pradt was probably the first to do this.¹⁴ His penetrating assertion that the two principles were the "primary, elementary datum, destined to form the basis of American policy" could not have failed to influence Jefferson. Though Pradt may not have originally implanted the ideas of an American system in Jefferson's mind, it is almost certain that he served to crystallize Jefferson's views in regard to it. The influence of Pradt is reflected in various ways.

Two letters by Jefferson, both indicating that his views in regard to American policy may have been affected, contain direct references to the book on the Congress of Aix-la-

American newspaper, which is omitted from the translated edition by Otis, but which was obtained by Pradt from *Le Moniteur Universelle* of November 24, 1818, which in turn had taken it from the *Washington Gazette*, a daily paper edited by Jonathan Elliot (see *Dictionary of American Biography*, VI. 92-93), in whose editorial columns for October 12, 1818, series 3, no. 280, it is to be found.

¹³ See J. Fred Rippy, *Rivalry of the United States and Great Britain over Latin America, 1808-1830* (Baltimore, 1929), *passim*.

¹⁴ Cf. Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), p. 98.

Chapelle. Shortly after receiving the book, on July 8, 1820, Jefferson wrote to Otis, the translator:

I thank you for De Pradt's book on the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle—it is a work I had never seen, and had much wished to see. Altho [*sic*] his style has too much of amphibology to be suited to the sober precision of Politics, yet we gather from him great outlines, and profound views of the new constitution of Europe and of its probable consequences. Those are things we should understand to know how to keep clear of them.¹⁵

Almost two years later, Jefferson, still impressed by the clairvoyant character of Pradt's book, revealed its effect upon himself. On March 2, 1822, in a letter to Edward Everett, in thanking him for a copy of a book written by Everett's brother, Jefferson observed:¹⁶

Tossed at random on an ocean of uncertainties and falsehoods, it is joyful at times to catch the glimmering of a beacon which shows us truly where we are. De Pradt's Europe had some effect in this way; but the less as the author was the less known in character.¹⁷

Indirectly also Jefferson revealed the probable influence of Pradt's *L'Europe après le Congrès d'Aix-la-Chapelle*. Shortly after¹⁸ receiving the book, Jefferson made a proposal of an American system to the Abbé José-Francisco Corrêa da Serra, a Portuguese naturalist to whom he was warmly attached, and who was appointed minister plenipotentiary of

¹⁵ Jefferson MSS. (in Library of Congress).

¹⁶ Alexander Hill Everett, *Europe: or a General Survey of the Present Situation of the Principal Powers: with Conjectures on their Future Prospects* (Boston, 1822).

¹⁷ Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 354-356. The emphasis of this quotation seems to be upon Pradt's book, but Jefferson graciously made a statement about the effect of books in general, so as to include Everett's book. He had probably not yet read the latter, for it was first sent from Boston on February 14. He used a similar metaphor in referring to Pradt's book on colonies (*ibid.*, XV. 144-150).

¹⁸ Jefferson must have received the book in the latter part of June, he acknowledged its receipt on July 8, and on August 4 he made his proposal.

Portugal,¹⁹ and also to President Monroe. As Portuguese minister, Corrêa was chiefly concerned with the suppression of piracies committed on Portuguese vessels under commissions and letters of marque issued by José Artigas, the military leader of Banda Oriental, which had broken away from Brazil.²⁰ Corrêa claimed indemnity from the United States government because some of the privateers, he alleged, were fitted out in American ports and manned in part by American citizens. This question troubled Corrêa for over five years, and Jefferson, as his friend, shared his vexation. As a solution of the problem, Jefferson suggested in 1820 the adoption of an American system, by which the United States and Portugal, which was an American power because its sovereign was still resident in Brazil, should reach an agreement with the European powers, whereby the former should suppress the piracies of the western hemisphere, while the latter should clear the seas of the eastern hemisphere of the Barbary pirates.

The significance of this proposal by Jefferson has been lost completely, for neither the importance he attached to it nor the solicitations he made in its behalf to the Portuguese minister, Corrêa, and to President Monroe have been known. In a letter to his friend William Short,²¹ often quoted because it expressed both Jefferson's views on religion and on foreign policy, is found the first statement of the proposed American system. Referring to Corrêa's recent visit to Monticello, Jefferson described his system on August 4, 1820, in a style so

¹⁹ For a sketch of Corrêa's life see *Biographie universelle*, IX. 258-259, or *Nouvelle biographie générale*, XI. 923-926. In 1813, Corrêa temporarily filled the place of Benjamin Smith Barton, professor of Natural History and Botany at the University of Pennsylvania, where he was offered a chair, which he refused.

²⁰ *British and Foreign State Papers*, IX. 275-283, contains the correspondence between the United States and Portugal relative to the claims for indemnity for piracies.

²¹ See article by Marie G. Kimball, "William Short, Jefferson's only 'Son,'" *The North American Review*, CCXXIII. 471-486, for a description of the friendship between the two.

grandiloquent that whatever practical import it may have had has been obscured. He wrote:

From many conversations with him, I hope he sees, and will promote in his new situation the advantages of a cordial fraternization among all the American nations, and the importance of their coalescing in an American system of policy, totally independent of and unconnected with that of Europe. The day is not distant, when we may formally require a meridian of partition through the ocean which separates the two hemispheres, on the hither side of which no European gun shall ever be heard, nor an American on the other; and when, during the rage of eternal wars of Europe, the lion and the lamb, within our regions, shall lie down together in peace. The excess of population in Europe, and want of room, render war, in their opinion, necessary to keep down that excess of numbers. Here room is abundant, population scanty, and peace the necessary means of life and happiness. The principles of society there and here, then, are radically different, and I hope no American patriot will ever lose sight of the essential policy of interdicting in the seas and territories of both Americas, the ferocious and sanguinary contests of Europe. I wish to see this coalition begun. I am earnest for an agreement with the maritime powers of Europe, assigning them the task of keeping down the piracies of their seas and the cannibalisms of the African coasts, and to us, the suppression of the same enormities within our seas; and for this purpose, I should rejoice to see the fleets of Brazil and the United States riding together as brethren of the same family, and pursuing the same object. And indeed it would be of happy augury to begin at once this concert of action here, on the invitation of either to the other government, while the way might be preparing for withdrawing our cruisers from Europe, and preventing naval collisions there which daily endanger our peace.²²

The actual attempts Jefferson made to introduce his American system have been overlooked also. The same day this letter was sent to Short, an extract from it was made by Jefferson's ingenious polygraph and was sent to an unknown person, who must be identified as President Monroe, as is obvious from the content of the latter's letter of August 23,

²² Jefferson to Short; Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 257-264.

1820, to Jefferson.²³ In later conversations with Monroe and Corrêa on the subject, Jefferson urged the necessity of the adoption of his American system.²⁴ Under the influence of Jefferson, Corrêa addressed to the department of state the proposal²⁵ that Portugal unite with the United States in the formulation of an "American system of politics, in contradistinction to an European".²⁶

The reaction of Adams and Monroe to this proposal is interesting in the light of subsequent events. Adams, the secretary of state, contemptuously recorded in his *Memoirs*, after conversing with Corrêa: "As to an American system, we have it; we constitute the whole of it; there is no community of interests or of principles between North and South America".²⁷ Monroe, however, evidently took into serious consideration Corrêa's proposal, which he knew came indirectly from Jefferson. The idea, he wrote to his secretary of state, "has something imposing in it".²⁸ To Jefferson he wrote, on returning the extract from the letter to William Short:

I return you the extract which you were so kind as to give me the perusal of. . . . The sentiments expressed in favor of an American

²³ This extract from Jefferson's letter to William Short is listed in the Jefferson Calendar, *Bulletin of the Bureau of Rolls and Library of the Department of State*, No. 6, p. 465, as Jefferson to Unknown, August 4, 1820. Monroe's reply to it is to be found in *The Writings of James Monroe*, Stanislaus M. Hamilton, ed. (7 vols.; New York and London, 1898-1903), VI. 151-152, hereafter cited as Monroe, *Writings*.

²⁴ Jefferson to Corrêa, October 24, 1820; Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 285-287. Also entry for September 19, 1820; Adams, *Memoirs*, V. 175.

²⁵ J. Q. Adams to J. J. Appleton, September 30, 1820; *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States Concerning the Independence of the Latin-American Nations*, William R. Manning, ed. (3 vols.; New York and London, 1925), I. 141.

²⁶ Quoted from Monroe's letter to Adams, August 11, 1820; *The Writings of John Quincy Adams*, Worthington C. Ford, ed. (7 vols.; New York, 1913-1917), VII. 63-64 n.

²⁷ Adams, *Memoirs*, V. 176. Adams believed erroneously that Corrêa had broached the subject of an American system to Jefferson. From Jefferson's letters of August 4, 1820 to Short, and of October 24, 1820 to Corrêa it is evident, however, that he took the initiative.

²⁸ Monroe to Adams, August 11, 1820; *The Writings of John Quincy Adams*, VII. 63-64 n.

interest and policy, extended in the first instance to the preservation of order, along our coast, & in our Seas, are sound, and will in all probability ripen into a system, at no distant period.²⁹

It is noteworthy that Monroe rejected the proposal of a Portuguese-American system of policy for practically the same reason that three years later he rejected Canning's proposal of an Anglo-American declaration of policy. "The effect", he wrote, "would be to connect us with Portugal in some degree against the revolutionary colonies".³⁰

Shortly after the rejection of this proposal of a Portuguese-American system of policy, Corrêa, with warm professions of friendship, wrote Jefferson of his intention of returning to Portugal.³¹ In his last letter to Corrêa on October 24, 1820, Jefferson revealed the significance he attached to his proposed system. He assured Corrêa:

Nothing is so important as that America shall separate herself from the system of Europe and establish one of her own. Our circumstances, our pursuits, our interests, are distinct, the principles of our policy should be also.

He again enclosed an extract from the letter to William Short, similar to the one sent to Monroe, with the asseveration that it contained his "creed on that subject", and "would be a leading principle" with him, had he longer to live".³²

The proposal of a Portuguese-American system, though rejected by Monroe, is significant because it brought the sub-

²⁹ Monroe to Jefferson, August 23, 1820; Monroe, *Writings*, VI. 151-152.

³⁰ Monroe to Adams, August 11, 1820; *The Writings of John Quincy Adams*, VII. 63-64 n. The reason which Monroe assigned for rejecting Canning's proposal was not such as would have been urged by Adams, who had little concern for the South American republics, as is evident from his reaction to Corrêa's proposal. Monroe wrote: "Had we mov'd with England, it is probable, that it would have been inferr'd that we acted under her influence, & at her instigation, & thus have lost credit as well with our Southern neighbors, as with the Allied powers". (Monroe, *Writings*, VI. 343-345).

³¹ Corrêa to Jefferson, October 12, 1820; Jefferson MSS. (in Library of Congress).

³² Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 285-287. See also Jefferson to John Adams, November 1, 1822; *ibid.*, XV. 400-403.

ject of an American system before the president's mind. In subsequent conversations upon the matter, Jefferson mapped out the course that the president was to follow.

The intimate relation existing between Jefferson and Monroe is well known. Monroe, when president, leaned heavily for advice in foreign affairs on both the two former presidents, Jefferson and Madison, who were passing their declining years on their Virginian estates of Monticello and Montpelier. Before Monroe became president, his home at Oakwood, a few miles from Monticello, was often the termination of Jefferson's daily rides. When Monroe went to Washington later Jefferson wrote wistfully:

To have terminated it [the daily ride] sometimes at Oakwood with a half-hour's conversation with those whose minds, familiarised with the same scenes would range with sympathy over the same topics would have chequered the monotony of a country life disengaged from country occupations.³³

Later, while Monroe was president, it was Jefferson's habit to meet him as often as possible to discuss the situation of affairs. "In these short interviews with you," wrote Jefferson retrospectively in June, 1823, "I generally get my political compass rectified, learn from you whereabouts we are, and correct my course again. In exchange for this I can give you but newspaper ideas. . . .",³⁴ and one may suppose, ideas in regard to the broad outlines of policy which were evolving in his mind.

Monroe's dependence upon Jefferson is apparent in the letter of June, 1823, when the president, failing to meet Jefferson as he had planned, wrote him that he regretted he had missed the opportunity of a free communication on the critical situation "as respects the present state of the world, & our relations with the acting parties in it, in Europe, & in this

³³ Jefferson to Monroe, June 14, 1823, "The Jefferson Papers", *Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections* (1900), 7th series, I. 321-322.

³⁴ Jefferson to Monroe, June 11, 1823; Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 435-439.

hemisphere", and questioned pertinently whether "we can, in any form, take a bolder attitude regarding it, in favor of liberty. . . ." ³⁵ Jefferson's reply is noteworthy: "I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States", he wrote,

never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government, are all foreign to us. . . . On our part, never had a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system, of peace and fraternity with mankind. . . . ³⁶

Later in 1823, Canning, the British foreign secretary, anxious to associate the government of the United States with that of Great Britain in a joint declaration against European interference in the question of the Spanish colonies, opened conversation with Richard Rush, American minister to the Court of St. James's. Canning set forth five propositions: 1. that the British government considered as hopeless the recovery of the colonies by Spain; 2. that the recognition of these colonies as independent states should be determined by time and circumstances; 3. that Great Britain would place no obstacle in the way of settlement by amicable negotiation between Spain and her colonies; 4. that Great Britain disclaimed all desire to obtain possession of any portion of the colonies; and 5. that she could not see with indifference the transfer of any portion of the colonies to any other power. Having no authority to accept Canning's proposals, Rush sent the dispatches to Monroe, who received them on October 9, just as he was on the point of leaving for Oakwood, his Virginia home. Adams, the secretary of state, had gone away to Quincy, and hence President Monroe turned naturally to Jefferson, to whom he sent the correspondence, along with a letter of his own, requesting him to submit it to Madison, and asking an opinion from each. "The project aims," he wrote,

³⁵ Monroe to Jefferson, June 2, 1823; Monroe, *Writings*, VI. 308-311.

³⁶ Jefferson to Monroe, June 11, 1823; Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 435-439.

in the first instance, at a mere expression of opinion, somewhat in the abstract. . . . My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposal of the British government, and to make known that we would view an interference on the part of the European powers, and especially an attack on the [Spanish-American] colonies by them, as an attack on ourselves.³⁷

In view of the importance of Jefferson's letter of October 24, which was evoked by this request, it is desirable to analyze it in some detail.³⁸ Its prime significance lies in its creative suggestion of a permanent system of American foreign policy, with principles so broad as to be capable of wide application to new cases, not thought of at the time, and not limited to the immediate issues presented by the Canning overtures. Jefferson assured Monroe that the question presented by the Canning correspondence was the "most momentous . . . since that of independence," and that the circumstances produced by it were "auspicious" for the introduction and establishment of *the* American system, whose principles he had elaborated in intimate contact with him since his proposal of such a system three years earlier. Jefferson's letter contained, further, a clear-cut delineation of this American system, just as it had been predicted by Pradt, with the United States assuming the leadership, and with two definite principles: an exclusion of all European influence from the new world and an abstention from all participation in the affairs of the old world.

Jefferson's letter, because of its advocacy of a bilateral pronouncement with Great Britain, has largely deprived him of whatever credit he deserves in the formulation of an American one. Jefferson urged Monroe to accede to Canning's proposition of a joint declaration as a temporary expedient, thereby hoping to eliminate the opposition of that country which alone could disturb the United States in the establishment of the American system, hoping further to prevent

³⁷ Monroe to Jefferson, October 17, 1823; Monroe, *Writings*, VI. 323-325.

³⁸ Jefferson to Monroe, October 24, 1823; Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 477-480.

European intervention in South America and emancipate a continent "at one stroke", and to effect a division in the European concert and throw "into the scale of free government" the power of Great Britain, which would enable the United States to administer a decisive blow to the political despotism of the so-called Holy Alliance not only in the new world but in the old as well. The object of this joint declaration with Great Britain, Jefferson declared, was "to introduce and establish the American system, of keeping out of our land all foreign powers, of never permitting those of Europe to intermeddle with the affairs of our nations. It is to maintain our own principle, not to depart from it."

The specific answers which Jefferson thought ought to be made to Canning's five propositions are further of interest. After passing over the first two points in silence, Jefferson asserted in regard to the third that the United States "will not stand in the way of any amicable arrangement" between Spain and its colonies. He considered carefully the fourth proposition requiring the United States to "disclaim all desire to obtain possession of any portion of the colonies" because of the strategic importance he attached to Cuba for the control of the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico, but agreed that the United States "aim not at the acquisition of any of those [the Spanish] possessions". In regard to the fifth point Jefferson laid down the principle, in language similar to that of Monroe's message when fully developed,

that we will oppose, with all our means, the forcible interposition of any other power, as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any other power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way.

For an evaluation of the influence of Jefferson and Adams upon Monroe in the formulation of his message one must chiefly rely, for want of other information, upon the *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*. These memoirs, mainly showing the share Adams had in the authorship of the Monroe Doctrine to

the neglect of other statesmen, are concerned, however, primarily with his statement of policy to be made in his drafts of reply to the Russian and British governments, and, with the exception of the entries for November 21 and 22, are not concerned with its formulation in the president's annual message. In using this source, then, it would be well to keep in mind the dictum of Lord Acton that memoirs alone cannot supply the certainty required by historical scholarship, and that they must be checked by all other available evidence. Unfortunately some of this evidence in regard to the crucial period in the evolution of the Monroe Doctrine is still withheld.³⁹ Furthermore, that which is available may properly be given a different interpretation than the one which has hitherto prevailed.

In the cabinet meeting of November 7, two days after Monroe's return from Virginia, Adams, suspicious of the overtures of Canning, vehemently opposed a joint declaration, insisting that the object of the British foreign secretary was to obtain a public pledge from the government of the United States against its own acquisition of any part of the Spanish-American possessions as much as against the forcible interference of the Holy Alliance.⁴⁰ Though he apparently persuaded Monroe that it would be more candid and dignified to make an avowal of the republican principles of the United States government independently of Great Britain, the latter, on learning of the French capture of Cadiz, and desirous of effectually checking the aggressions of the Holy Alliance, hesitated to decline Canning's invitation to concert of action. Meantime, Canning's interest in a joint Anglo-American

³⁹ *The Writings of John Quincy Adams*, extend only to the middle of 1823, and thus stop at a point where they might throw additional light on the parts played by Adams, Jefferson, and Monroe in the formulation of the principles of the message. The Adams family papers have been deposited with the Massachusetts Historical Society with the stipulation that no use can be made of them. The trustees of the material have gone so far as to register with the Norfolk County Deeds their Trust in order to indicate such non-use.

⁴⁰ Adams, *Memoirs*, VI, 177.

policy was terminated by an agreement with the French government, which he thought rendered any declaration against European intervention, either singly or jointly, quite unnecessary. These changed views of Canning were reflected in the dispatches from Rush, which Adams received on November 16, and which confirmed the latter's suspicions as to the objectives of the British proposal.⁴¹

The next day, the secretary of state drew up the official answer of the United States government to the invitation of the British government, replying categorically to Canning's five propositions.⁴² Adams concurred in the first. In regard to the second, he pointed out that the United States had regarded the recovery of the colonies by Spain as hopeless and had, consequently, recognized them as free and independent states. In answer to the third, he insisted that the amicable arrangement between the colonies and Spain should be made contingent upon independence. He concurred in the last two propositions, but added that since the South American states were free and independent, they, and not the Holy Alliance, or Great Britain, or the United States had the right to dispose of their possessions. He further made a joint declaration of policy dependent upon British recognition of the new republics, and concluded his dispatch with the observation

that for the most effectual accomplishment of the object common to both governments, a perfect understanding with regard to it being established between them, it will be most advisable that they should act separately. . . .

Adams thus effectively prevented a bilateral declaration of policy. But did he substitute a unilateral one?

The answer to the British government, as drawn up by Adams, contained none of the broad principles of foreign policy generally associated with the Monroe Doctrine. More-

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, VI. 188.

⁴² Worthington C. Ford, "John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 33-37, conveniently presented the draft of Adams and the alterations by Monroe in parallel columns.

over, the later communications from Rush had removed the occasion for enunciating any such principles. The nearest approach to the principles of the president's message were those contained in the substitution made by Monroe in Adam's first draft, which was deleted from the final draft, and which bears a close resemblance to Jefferson's reply to the fifth proposition of Canning. It reads:

Much less could we behold with indifference the transfer of those new govts., or of any portion of the spanish possessions, to other powers, especially of the territories, bordering on, or nearest to the United States.

Monroe's reference to Cuba, likewise deleted from the final draft, also shows the influence of Jefferson.

The principle of non-colonization in the language of Monroe's message was stated first in a draft of minutes upon subjects under the direction of the department of state, which the secretary thought should be considered by the president in his annual address. The diplomatic negotiations in connection with which it arose were those concerning the territorial claims of Russia and Great Britain to the northwest coast of America, which afforded a strong ground upon which to base the opposition of the United States government to further colonization of the American continents by European powers. This draft of minutes was prepared on November 13, before any agreement had been reached in the cabinet as to the answer to be made to the British government. There is thus no reason to believe that it arose out of, or was intended as an answer to the Canning overtures. In a meeting with a president on the same day, Adams read this draft, while the former, it seems, hastily jotted down the points enumerated in it on a bit of scrap paper in a writing hardly decipherable.⁴³

⁴³ Adams, *Memoirs*, VI. 185. This draft of minutes is to be found among the Monroe MSS. in the New York Public Library, as is also "Mr. Adams's Sketch", which is based upon it. It consists of four pages of manuscript. Monroe undoubtedly jotted down the points contained in his "Mr. Adams's Sketch", as he labeled it, on November 13, while Adams read them to him, for the draft of

This draft furnished the basis for the points discussed by Monroe in the first part of his message, sketches of which he presented in the cabinet meeting of November 21.⁴⁴ It gave rise to the principle, which was incorporated by Monroe without verbal change in the seventh paragraph of his message,

that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by European powers.

Aside from the principle of non-colonization, which grew out of the specific contingency created by the Russian and British territorial claims to the northwest coast of America, Adams failed completely to suggest an enunciation of an American system of policy in the annual presidential message. Neither the draft of minutes made by Adams on November 13 nor the sketch of it made by Monroe contain any reference to any such declaration, nor do they contain the cardinal tenets of non-participation in European affairs and European non-participation in American affairs.⁴⁵ The *Memoirs* of Adams likewise contain no intimation of his desire to see a public pronouncement such as Monroe actually made. On the contrary, they reveal that the secretary of state knew nothing of the president's intention in this regard until after the British minutes was left with Monroe, thus removing all occasion for making a sketch at a later date.

⁴⁴ The message contains three paragraphs of introduction, then eight paragraphs that take care of most of the points suggested by Adams, then thirty-five paragraphs dealing with various matters, four of which deal with matters suggested by Adams, then four paragraphs containing the references to Greece, Spain, Portugal, and South America, one of which contains the essential principles of the message. This enumeration is based on the message as contained in the *American State Papers* (Foreign Relations), (38 vols.; Washington, 1832-1861), V. 245-260.

⁴⁵ Worthington C. Ford, in his article on "John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 28 n. reluctantly admitted: "I was in the belief that it was an incomplete paper until I found in the Ford collection, in the same library, a rough note in Monroe's writing of 'Adams's Sketch', closely following the heads of the Adams manuscript and leaving no doubt of its covering all the points of that paper".

government had been officially answered. There can thus be no question of a substitution by Adams of a unilateral for a bilateral declaration.

For the separate statement of an American system of policy in the latter part of the presidential message, which came up for cabinet discussion after the British invitation to a joint declaration had become a closed incident, Jefferson must receive chief credit. In his letter of advice, Jefferson specifically urged that the declaration of policy be brought to the attention of congress in the presidential message. As a consequence, Monroe, after having presented the paragraphs dealing with the matters suggested by Adams's draft of minutes in the cabinet meeting of November 21, read two additional paragraphs, which contained the first sketches of the Monroe Doctrine *per se*.⁴⁶ These sketches contained references to Greece, Spain, Portugal, and South America, in connection with which the president developed the basic principles of his message, and their inclusion was suggested by the letters of Madison and Jefferson.⁴⁷ In its final form, the paragraph containing the reference to the cause of Greek independence preceded, while that containing the reference to the late events in Spain and Portugal followed, the paragraph that embodied the fundamental doctrine of Monroe's message. The paragraph which contained the two principles related to the doctrine of two spheres was largely an elaboration of Jefferson's letter of October 24. The impress of this letter upon Monroe's paragraph is unmistakable.

The fundamental maxim, Jefferson insisted, was "never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe". Monroe restated it in his message thus: "In the wars of the European powers

⁴⁶ Adams, *Memoirs*, VI. 194. In reviewing the proceedings of the cabinet meetings five days later Adams asserted that two paragraphs had been submitted on November 21 (*ibid.*, VI. 204).

⁴⁷ Jefferson to Monroe, October 24, 1823; Jefferson, *Writings*, XV. 477-480. Madison to Monroe, October 20, 1823; *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison*, III. 339-340; Madison to Jefferson, November 1, 1823; *ibid.*, III. 341.

in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do”.

The supplementary principle, Jefferson stated, was “never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs”, insisting that “America, North and South, has a set of interests of her own”, that “she should therefore have a system of her own”, and that the United States “will oppose, with all our means, the forcible interposition of any other power, as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any other power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way”. Monroe elaborated it thus:

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different . . . from that of America. . . . We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence . . . , we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Moreover, there is conclusive evidence as to who influenced the president in drawing up his paragraph in regard to South America, in connection with which he stated the doctrine of two spheres, in the form of a letter written by Monroe to Jefferson on December 4th, which accompanied the copy of the presidential message. Monroe wrote:

I have concurr'd thoroughly with the sentiments express'd in your late letter, as I am persuaded, you will find, by the message, as to the part we ought to act, toward the allied powers, in regard to S. America. I consider the cause of that country, as essentially our own.⁴⁸

It is, therefore, quite certain that, through the influence of

⁴⁸ Monroe to Jefferson, December 4, 1823; Monroe, *Writings*, VI. 342.

Jefferson, the overtures of Canning for a joint declaration of policy resulted in that demarcation of distinct spheres of influence for the old world and for the new, which is generally considered the essence of the Monroe Doctrine.

This positive contribution of Jefferson to the enunciation of the doctrine of two spheres has been submerged, however, by the mass of evidence which Adams presented in his *Memoirs* in regard to his own contribution, which is of a negative character. Having been assured by Jefferson that, with the friendship of Great Britain, the American declaration might challenge the political activities of the Holy Alliance even in matters exclusively European, Monroe proposed to condemn, "in terms of the most pointed reprobation", its aggressions in Spain and Greece. In a note to Adams just before the cabinet meeting of November 21, Monroe questioned "whether any, and if any, what notice shall be taken of Greece, and also of the invasion of Spain by France".⁴⁹ It is clear from the *Memoirs* of Adams that nothing was contemplated beyond a severe rebuke to the French government for its invasion of Spain and a recommendation for the recognition of the Greeks as an independent nation. The sketches of the two paragraphs containing the references to Greece and Spain are not available in their original form, and it is therefore not possible to establish the degree to which they would have involved the government of the United States in European affairs. In any case, it is clear, however, that the denunciation of the procedure of the European powers, which Monroe suggested *only tentatively* as worthy of consideration, would not have prevented an enunciation of the doctrine of two spheres, though it would not have been strictly consistent with its application. It is, therefore, to the credit of Adams that, during the week-end of November 21 to November 24, he dissuaded the president from including such a denunciation in his message. In the cabinet meeting on Friday, November 21, he immediately opposed the president's reproof, and expressed the wish that

⁴⁹ Quoted by Ford, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 40 n.

he would reconsider the whole subject before he should determine to take that course. "The message", he declared, "would at once buckle on the harness and throw down the gauntlet". At the close of the cabinet meeting, Monroe agreed to draw up two drafts of a message, "conformable to the two different aspects of the subject".⁵⁰ On Saturday, Adams again urged Monroe "to abstain from everything in his message which the Holy Allies could make a pretext for construing into aggression upon them". Monroe assured him that "he would fully consider what he should say, and when prepared with his draft would call a meeting of the administration".⁵¹ The following Monday, Adams was "highly gratified" that the president had changed his course.⁵² He found the draft which Monroe read to him "quite unexceptionable", and "drawn up altogether in the spirit" he "had so urgently pressed" on Monroe on Friday and Saturday, and "entirely conformable to the system of policy" he had "earnestly recommended for this emergency".⁵³

Though Adams apparently influenced Monroe to confine his opposition to the activities of the Holy Alliance to the American sphere, did he, in any other way, affect the enunciation of the doctrine of two spheres as contained in the presidential message? In answer to this question it is well to observe, first, that Adams apparently had no share in the actual formulation of the two-spheres doctrine promulgated by Monroe on December 2, for the president assured his secretary of state he would consider fully what he should say, and would submit his statement for consideration when finished. Furthermore, whatever influence the secretary of state exerted upon the president in the formulation of his doctrine was confined to the week-end from Friday, November 21, when Monroe first read the sketches of his address, to Monday, November 24, when he read its last four paragraphs, one of which contains its basic doctrine, in substantially their final

⁵⁰ Adams, *Memoirs*, VI. 195-196.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, VI. 199.

⁵² *Ibid.*, VI. 196-198.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

form. Several facts indicate this. Monroe stated on November 22 that he would call a cabinet meeting as soon as he had prepared his draft.⁵⁴ On November 24, he read the paragraph respecting Greece, Spain, Portugal, and South America to Adams, who pronounced them "quite unexceptionable".⁵⁵ He called a cabinet meeting the next day, indicating thereby that the draft was finished.⁵⁶ In the cabinet discussions, lasting from November 25 to 27, the primary question was not whether Monroe's paragraph, containing his enunciation of the doctrine, was satisfactory, but whether this paragraph should be sent as a reply to the Russian government.⁵⁷ The references in the *Memoirs* of Adams to this paragraph,⁵⁸ and the internal evidence in the communication to the Russian government,⁵⁹ which was avowedly based on it, indicate that its contents were those that appeared in the message of December 2.

Adams should not be given credit for the doctrine of two spheres as found in the latter part of Monroe's message for several reasons. If he did urge upon Monroe the promulgation of an American system of policy, for which there is no evidence, his conception of such a system made it unlikely that he influenced the president in the formulation of his message during the week-end of November 21 to 24. Adams, like Jefferson, had elaborated upon an American system three years earlier. In a dispatch to the minister at St. Petersburg he had stated:

The political system of the United States is also extra-European. To stand in firm and cautious independence of all entanglement in the European system has been a cardinal point of their policy under every administration of their government from the peace of 1783 to this day. . . . For the repose of Europe as well as of America, the Euro-

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, VI. 198.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, VI. 199.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, VI. 199-216.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, VI. 199-200.

⁵⁹ This communication is to be found in Ford, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 41-44.

pean and American political systems should be kept as separate and distinct from each other as possible.⁶⁰

Unlike Jefferson, however, whose American system embraced both North and South America in the belief that the whole of the western hemisphere would become republican in its form of government, Adams set forth a system that was *exclusively national* in character, limited strictly to the *direct interests* of the United States. For, shortly after he issued the foregoing statement, the proposal of an American system, made by the Portuguese minister, Corrêa, at the instigation of Jefferson, was brought to his attention, and in rejecting it, he recorded in his *Memoirs*, as already noted: "As to an American system, we have it; we constitute the whole of it; there is no community of interests or of principles between North and South America".⁶¹ There is no evidence that Adams's conception of the American system was enlarged so as to include South America until after Monroe's proposal to deal with the question of the Spanish-colonies in his message. It was South America, however, in which the president was particularly interested, and in reference to which he made his statement of the doctrine of two spheres. Further, the later communications of the British government, as has been shown, had removed the occasion for making a joint declaration of policy in regard to the proposed intervention of the Holy Alliance in South America. It is then far more likely that Monroe broached the principles to be made in regard to the South American republics to Adams, and not Adams to Monroe.

Moreover, Adams, unlike Jefferson, whose American system consisted in the enunciation of certain broad principles that were to guide the United States in the conduct of its foreign affairs, thought of his system of policy as mainly an exposition of the republican principles of that government. This fact is apparent throughout his *Memoirs*. In the cabinet

⁶⁰ Adams to Henry Middleton, July 5, 1820; *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, VII, 49.

⁶¹ See *ante*, p. 10.

meeting of November 7, Adams made it clear that he thought the various papers to be drawn up in answer to the proposal of Canning and to the communications from the Russian government "must all be parts of a combined system of policy and adapted to each other",⁶² but this system, he thought, should be nothing more than a statement of the republican principles of the United States in contrast to the monarchical principles of the Holy Alliance.⁶³ At least, his early reply to the Russian government contains nothing more. When, on November 17, he received the manifesto of Count Nesselrode, which in his opinion, "bearded us to our faces upon the monarchical principles of the Holy Alliance",⁶⁴ he determined to make a counter-exposition of republicanism. In the cabinet meetings after November 24, on which day he heard the paragraph which contained the fundamental doctrine of the president's message in its completed form, he attached more significance to his own exposition of republican principles than to Monroe's statement of principles of foreign policy. The *Memoirs* of Adams relating to the cabinet meetings of November 25 to 27 revolve about the discussions regarding the answer to be made to the Russian government. Calhoun, the secretary of war, insisted that the president's paragraph, containing his enunciation of principles, should be sent as an answer to the Russian government, while Adams wanted his own draft sent, which contained an elaboration of Monroe's principles plus an exposition of the republican principles of the government of the United States. The intense concern of the secretary of state that this exposition be retained is revealed in his *Memoirs*.⁶⁵ The paragraph "containing the exposition of our principles", he asserted, was "the heart of the paper" from which "all the rest was only a series of deductions", and without which "the rest was a fabric without a foundation".⁶⁶ It is logical to conclude that he stressed this

⁶² Adams, *Memoirs*, VI. 179.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, VI. 194-214.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, VI. 201.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, VI. 199-216, esp. pp. 211-216.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, VI. 211.

exposition because it originated in his own mind, and that he failed to regard as more significant the principles which followed from it, because they originated in the mind of some one else.

Moreover, from his *Memoirs* it is apparent that, far from originating the basic principles of the presidential message that should guide American foreign policy, Adams actually depended upon Monroe for their statement in his answers to the British and Russian governments. On November 24, when the president had completed his statement of principles, Adams heard the paragraph which contained it, and the next day he drew up a draft of a reply to the Russian government to correspond to it.⁶⁷ On three occasions, Adams acknowledged that the communication to the Russian government was based upon this paragraph of Monroe's message. For the first time he recorded in his *Memoirs* that the draft "was drawn to correspond exactly" with the paragraph of Monroe's message;⁶⁸ for the second time, that it "said in substance the same as the draft of the paper", though "there was more development" in his own draft, and though "there was an ostentatious display of republican *contrasted* with monarchical principles";⁶⁹ for the third time, that it "was prepared precisely to correspond with the paragraph in the message".⁷⁰ In this dispatch to the Russian government, Adams's principle of non-colonization is not to be found, indicating that he did not associate it with his exposition of republicanism, from which it might well have emanated, and that he never conceived of the system of policy as consisting of a statement of principles of foreign policy. Likewise, the dispatch of November 30 to Richard Rush was prepared after Adams had become thoroughly familiar with the principles of Monroe's message. Its object, he stated,

is to communicate to you the views of the President with regard to the more general consideration of the affairs of South America; to

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, VI. 199.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, VI. 206.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, VI. 207.

serve for your government, and to be used according to your discretion, in any further intercourse which you may have with the British Cabinet on this subject.⁷¹

Though statements made by Adams both before and after the president informed him of his intention of enunciating an American policy in his annual message reflect the narrow and doctrinaire conception of the system he "earnestly recommended for this emergency", there are, nevertheless, evidences which might indicate that he envisaged something more than a mere exposition of republican principles. It might be pointed out that passages recorded by Adams in his *Memoirs* after the cabinet meeting of November 21 bear a remarkable similarity both in their language and intent to the doctrine of two spheres as found in Monroe's address of December 2. However, by November 21, Adams had already read Jefferson's "decisively pronounced" delineation of the doctrine, which was submitted to him by Monroe six days previously, and on November 21 he heard the president's sketches of his message, which may have contained an enunciation of the doctrine.⁷² Hence, the principles he entered in his *Memoirs* on that day cannot be accepted unquestioningly as his own. Further, the president's paragraph containing the fundamental doctrine of the message was drawn up in its completed form by November 24, as has been shown, thus antedating the most important of the diplomatic drafts penned by Adams in reply to the British and Russian governments and also the most significant of his entries in his *Memoirs*.⁷³ His communication of November 27 to the Rus-

⁷¹ Dispatch to Rush, quoted by Ford, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 46.

⁷² The statements recorded November 21, 1823 (*Memoirs*, VI. 194), and November 22 (*ibid.*, VI. 197-198), and his instructions to Heman Allen, November 23 (Monroe, *Writings*, VI. 400-401) were made by Adams after he had heard Monroe's sketches on November 21, and after he had read Jefferson's letter of October 24 on November 15, a date, which "precedes that of the more important of Adams' diplomatic drafts".—James Schouler, "The Authorship of the Monroe Doctrine", *Am. Hist. Assoc., Annual Report* (1905), I. 130.

⁷³ Adams recorded on November 25 (*Memoirs*, VI. 199-200) that the answer to the Russian government "was meant also to be eventually an exposition of the

sian government and his dispatch of November 30 to Rush, both of which were built upon the president's paragraph, furnished the basis upon which his claims to the authorship of the doctrine of two spheres in the message have rested and must largely rest.⁷⁴

For the momentous declaration of 1823, which forms the cornerstone of American foreign policy, a greater measure of credit must, therefore, be accorded the white-haired sage of Monticello. In his intimacy with his neighbor at Oakwood, he developed the American system, first impressing upon the president the importance of its adoption in 1820, asserting that it would be a "leading principle" with him had he longer to live, and finding in Canning's overtures three years later the "auspicious" circumstances in which "to introduce and establish" it. So far as the secretary of state was concerned

principles of this Government, and a brief development of its political system as henceforth to be maintained: essentially republican—maintaining its own independence, and respecting that of others; essentially pacific—studiously avoiding all involvement in the combinations of European politics, cultivating peace and friendship with the most absolute monarchies, . . . but declaring that, having recognized the independence of the South American States, we could not see with indifference any attempt by European powers by forcible interposition either to restore the Spanish dominion on the American Continents or to introduce monarchical principles into those countries, or to transfer any portion of the ancient or present American possession of Spain to any other European power". Ford in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 28-52, failed to note the fact that Monroe's statement of the doctrine antedates this entry in Adams's memoirs, as have most writers who followed him. W. F. Reddaway, *The Monroe Doctrine* (2d ed., New York, 1905), pp. 61-62, assumed that Monroe's paragraph embodied the recommendations of Adams, and then asserted his entry described the paragraph "in words which seem to depict the Monroe Doctrine when full grown". It must first be shown indisputably that Adams formulated the principles of Monroe's paragraph before this entry, or any other, can be taken as an indication of Adams's influence upon Monroe.

⁷⁴ Ford, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VIII. 41-48. Albert Bushnell Hart, *The Monroe Doctrine, An Interpretation* (Boston, 1916), p. 61. Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826*, in an incidental reference to the reply to the Russian government asserted that this document "was modelled on the language of Monroe", (p. 75) but in the fuller discussion of this reply he failed to make this fact apparent (pp. 85-89) and described it as "one of the most remarkable he [Adams] ever penned, and which parallels the language of the Monroe message".

the invitation of the British government to a joint declaration of policy and the communications from the Russian government would not have resulted in a demarcation of distinct spheres of action for the old world and the new, but merely in a didactic exposition of the republican principles of the government of the United States. The doctrine of two spheres was the contribution of Jefferson to Monroe's message.⁷⁵ Just as Monroe took over the principles of non-colonization from Adams's draft of minutes, so he depended upon Jefferson's letter for a statement of the doctrine of two spheres. As a result the American system that was elaborated included both North and South America and contained a statement of two definite principles that should guide the United States, as the leading American power, in its foreign policy. The paragraph which contained the statement of the doctrine of two spheres bore the imprint of Jefferson's letter, just as this letter bore that of the Abbé de Pradt's remarkable prediction

⁷⁵ Dexter Perkins, who has done the most careful work on the origins of the Monroe doctrine, noted that Adams did not suggest a public enunciation of an American system of policy in the presidential message (*The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826*, p. 74), that the initiative for it came from Monroe (*The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, Samuel Flagg Bemis, ed., 10 vols.; New York, 1928; IV. 69-70), and that the place in the message of the paragraph containing it suggested a different origin than that of Adams (*The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826*, p. 75), but, nevertheless, he concluded that Adams was chiefly responsible for the doctrine of two spheres in the message (*ibid.*, pp. 102-103). He failed to take account of the previous influence of Jefferson upon Monroe toward the establishment of an American system of policy, and discounted the immediate influence of Jefferson because his letter of advice was dated October 24 (erroneously dated October 30 by Perkins), and consequently could not have affected Monroe almost a month later. It is well to observe, however, that Monroe did not read Jefferson's letter until after he had returned from Virginia on November 5, that ten days later he showed the letter to Adams, and that six days later he first made known to Adams his intention of making a public pronouncement of policy. The conclusion of Perkins that "it was only . . . when added to to some other factor that the views of Jefferson affected the temper of the American manifesto" may thus be questioned, as well as the general conclusion, having its latest expression in James Truslow Adams, *The Adams Family* (New York, 1930), that the credit for the Monroe doctrine, "if not wholly, at least in the main, must be given to Adams".

of an American system in his *L'Europe après le Congrès d'Aix-la-Chapelle, faisant suite au Congrès de Vienne*. Jefferson, then, more than any other individual, was responsible for the basic doctrine of Monroe's message of 1823.

T. R. SCHELLENBERG.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE BOUNDARIES OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE

While the hypothesis has already been suggested that France and Spain delimited Louisiana in 1762, fixing the Mississippi and lower Rio Grande as boundaries by treaty even more secret than the deed of transfer to Spain,¹ the paucity of the evidence hitherto cited may justify the presentation of new material strengthening the hypothesis. By the terms of the treaty of San Ildefonso (1800), repeated in the American Purchase treaty of 1803, Louisiana was ceded

with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it, and as it should be after the treaties subsequently entered into between Spain and other states.

These words have long been considered an enigma. Little suspecting that Louisiana may have been demarked by previous treaty, historians have deemed them "indefinite and contradictory", for early French Louisiana had extended east to the Perdido, while Spanish Louisiana ended at the Mississippi. Though some have thought Napoleon, preparing by "indefiniteness" and "indirection", to prefer territorial claims too extravagant to avow at once, this definition of Louisiana may have concealed no sinister intent. Some writers, pointing to the last clause and to Spain's acquisition of British West Florida in 1783, have thought that Napoleon meant to claim that region as part of Louisiana. But on taking over the province in 1802 Napoleon stated expressly to his agent that West Florida had been cut off from Louisiana in 1762-1763 and formed no part of the Louisiana recovered

¹ "The Western Boundary of Louisiana, 1762-1803", by the present writer, in *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XXXV. 95-108 (October, 1931). Some of the data is repeated with consent of Professor E. C. Barker, the editor of the *Quarterly*.

from Spain.² He had merely desired it, and Talleyrand's plan in 1800 for a Spanish treaty reads:

Spain pledges herself to retrocede to the French Republic the colony of Louisiana, with the same extent it actually has in the hands of Spain and such as it should be according to the treaties subsequently passed between Spain and other states. Spain shall further join in this cession that of the two Floridas, eastern and western, with their actual limits.³

If there had been a prior Franco-Spanish boundary agreement, the enigmatical wording of 1800 would seem definite enough, as well as natural, for a geographical restatement of limits already determined would have been unnecessary. Had there been no earlier delimitation, the failure to make one in 1800 would be somewhat strange and difficult to explain on Spain's part. France ceded to England in 1762-1763 "everything which she possesses, or ought to possess, on the left side of the river, Mississippi, except the town of New Orleans". Although this land had been part of Louisiana, France in giving to Spain the trans-Mississippi portion at Fontainebleau on November 3, 1762, ceded according to the deed of transfer not "Western Louisiana" but the entire province of "Louis-

² Instructions from Decrès, Minister of Marine, to General Victor, November 26, 1802, in J. A. Robertson, *Louisiana under Spain, France and the United States* (Cleveland, 1911), I. 361.

³ Henry Adams, *History of the United States* (New York, 1891-1898), I. 366, 367; I. J. Cox, *The West Florida Controversy* (Baltimore, 1918) pp. 74, 75. Talleyrand later assured Monroe: "The Spanish government has constantly refused to cede any part of the Floridas, even from the Mississippi to the Mobile". Talleyrand to Monroe, December 21, 1804, in *State Papers and Public Documents* (3rd ed., Boston, 1819), XII. 203-205.

Almost the exact wording of this French plan was incorporated in the treaty of San Ildefonso. Overlooking this and relying on a garbled version of the treaty of San Ildefonso as translated in an early American book, Francis P. Burns has suggested that the "ambiguous" definition of Louisiana first appeared in the Spanish king's order of October 15, 1802, delivering the province to France, and that France thus "accepted the cession of Louisiana, under the designation as proposed by the Spanish government". Burns, "West Florida and the Louisiana Purchase", in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XV. 391-416 (July, 1932).

iana" without definition—"tout le pays connu sous le nom de la Louisiane, ainsi que la Nouvelle Orleans et l'Isle"—presupposing the delimitation of this new Louisiana. French and Spanish territories were not separated by *de jure* boundaries before 1762, in which year Grimaldi, fearing England's control of the Mississippi, objected to a division along that river; Choiseul replied that France hoped to keep control of the mouth but would, if England insisted on free navigation, make no settlement without a previous agreement between the Bourbon monarchs. Talleyrand laconically assured Monroe that the monarchs did have an "understanding" in 1762 as to the extent of Louisiana on its transfer; but that it went further than the eastern boundary he would not say.⁴

Judge Beverly Tucker of Virginia, one of the few Americans who learned belatedly of what seems to have been the real basis of Napoleon's claim to Texas, says:

About 1762, just before the cession of Louisiana by France to Spain the Rio del Norte was established as the boundary by treaty. The subsequent cession made that treaty of no consequence, and it was forgotten. But meantime a copy had been furnished the vice-regal government of Mexico where Branch Archer told me, in 1833, it had been seen by many persons of his acquaintance during the connexion between Texas and Mexico . . . Jos. M. White, about the same time assured me that a *copy of the article had been furnished him* by the *French Minister* of foreign affairs. . . . France if properly called upon, is bound to produce the treaty of boundary.⁵

So new and curious a tale might well seem fanciful to Secretary Calhoun, but Tucker assured him that as to "the authen-

⁴ W. R. Shepherd, "The Cession of Louisiana to Spain", in *Political Science Quarterly*, XIX. 441-443; Talleyrand to Monroe, as cited in note 3; Adams, *History of the United States*, II. 295-300; Cox, *The West Florida Controversy*, pp. 109, 110.

⁵ Tucker to John C. Calhoun, Secretary of State, November 13, 1844, in J. F. Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of Calhoun*, p. 1008 note, in *Am. Hist. Assn. Report*, 1899, II.; and in C. S. Boucher and R. P. Brooks (eds.), "Correspondence to Calhoun", in *ibid.*, 1929, pp. 258-262.

ticity of the information given to me by Mr. White . . . I cannot be mistaken”:

The language of the treaty of Cession by France to the United States strongly intimates the existence of some document defining the limits of Louisiana as ceded by France to Spain, and by Spain back again to France. This, and other circumstances put Mr. W. on the enquiry. His large interest in Spanish Florida grants determined him to prosecute it, at the expense of spending a great part of his time in Europe. . . . He learned that somewhere about 1760 a treaty of a secret character had been concluded between France and Spain, then governed by two branches of Bourbon, and that into that treaty an article defining the bounds of Louisiana was introduced. He applied to the French Minister of foreign affairs for a copy which was refused. He then went to Talleyrand, then in London, to invoke his influence with the Minister, and procured from him a letter expressing the opinion that the article in question, tho’ in a treaty otherwise secret, might be divulged without impropriety. Thereupon a copy was furnished, from which it appeared that the Rio Bravo and the Mississippi, including the Island of New Orleans, were the agreed boundaries. Such was his account to me.

A week afterwards I repeated this conversation to Branch’ Archer, who said he had often heard that there was such an article among the archives of Mexico, whither it had been immediately sent, for the information of the vice-regal government. The cession taking place immediately after, the document was no longer of any consequence, and was not made notorious by any action upon it.

Mr. W. died at St. Louis on a visit to a brother [in 1840]. . . . Millions of ours depended on that paper, and they whose interests were to be affected by it, may have been quite ready to secure its suppression, and Mr. W’s silence by a liberal compromise of *his* claims. . . .⁶

White’s trip to Europe on this mission in 1833 (the year he apprised Judge Tucker of his discovery) is also detailed by Henry A. Wise of Virginia, who quotes Talleyrand as having

⁶ Tucker to Calhoun, December 12, 1844, in Jameson, *Correspondence of Calhoun*, pp. 1008, 1009. For more about White, who was the Florida delegate in Congress for many years, see the writer’s paper in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XXXV. 98, 99.

said to Judge White: "Yes, the boundaries between the French and Spanish territories had been fixed by a certain treaty which was secret . . . and could be had at his order".⁷ White himself, who was a large holder of the much-litigated West Florida land claims, has merely told the public briefly that Texas "was anciently a part of the province of Louisiana. . . . It was marked off on the maps of the Marquis Barbé Marbois, the Minister of Napoleon, as a part of the Louisiana cession to the United States in 1803, but abandoned in 1819".⁸ The secret treaty of 1762 was also heard of by John M. Galt of Virginia, who wrote in April, 1844, in an essay on "The Annexation of Texas":

The treaty was a secret one, formed between the courts of Spain and France, about the period of what is denominated in history, "The Family Compact;" by a clause of which, the section now forming Texas was ceded to France. The existence of this treaty was known to the Spanish government even in 1819, but the fact was concealed from the United States.⁹

White's testimony points to a delimitation, prior to the cession to Spain in November, 1762, and this possibility seems very likely. Charles III. of Spain had actually desired Louisiana as early as 1760, when he declared to the French ambassador: "I believe, as you do, that we are natural and necessary allies. . . . I must arrange with France after the peace for Louisiana by means of some exchange".¹⁰ In the spring

⁷ Wise, *Seven Decades of the Union* (Philadelphia, 1872), pp. 107-109.

⁸ J. M. White, *A New Collection of Laws, Charters and Local Ordinances of the Governments of Great Britain, France and Spain, Relating to the Concessions of Land in Their Respective Colonies; together with the Laws of Mexico and Texas on the Same Subject* (Philadelphia, 1839), I. xi, xii.

⁹ "The Annexation of Texas", Part I, April 10, 1844, in Galt, *Political Essays* (Williamsburg, 1852), p. 4. Galt's source was probably Tucker.

¹⁰ A. S. Aiton, "The Diplomacy of the Louisiana Cession", in *American Historical Review*, XXXVI. 701-720, discredits the view that Louisiana was a "white elephant" in the eyes of Spain—a view which was held by C. E. A. Gayarré, *History of Louisiana* (New York, 1854), II. 94, 227, and more recently by W. R. Shepherd. That Grimaldi disfavored the acquisition and expressed

of 1761 Spain proposed that definite boundaries be finally fixed for Louisiana.¹¹ The question arises: what influence was exerted on France's Louisiana policy by the Family Compact of 1760-1761 for united opposition against England? The treaties of alliance declare, rather optimistically, that on the conclusion of peace "the advantages gained by one of the two powers shall compensate for the losses the other may have sustained", and that "from the day of the date of this convention the losses and gains shall be common".¹² The territory east of the Mississippi being demanded by England in the preliminary peace negotiations in July, 1762, it may be that the remaining Louisiana was delimited on the west by the lower Rio Grande, or Rio Bravo del Norte, to compensate France for its restriction on the east.¹³

In July, 1762, the Spanish minister, Grimaldi, protesting against Choiseul's decision to cede cis-Mississippi Louisiana to England by attaching it to Canada, reminded him that Spain had always deemed the French mere interlopers in the valley; their territorial claim being "not legitimate nor recognized by Spain", the king felt entitled to be consulted in its disposition. Until August, 1762, Grimaldi received no instructions from the king to guide him with reference to Louisiana. Ricardo Wall, Spanish chief minister of state, wrote Grimaldi in August:

himself as preferring that France retain Louisiana as a barrier between England's and Spain's territories seems to have led to confusion.

¹¹ N. M. Miller Surrey, *Calendar of the Manuscripts in Paris Archives and Libraries relating to the History of the Mississippi Valley to 1803* (Washington, 1928), II. 1394.

¹² Shepherd, *op. cit.*, 441 note, quoting from Cantillo, *Tratados, Convenios y Declaraciones de Paz y de Comercio*, pp. 471, 483.

¹³ After all, the Spaniards had failed in many attempts to hold their own in Texas against nature and the hostile roving Indians, over whom the less overbearing and more facile, insinuating French had exercised much more influence and control. Texas was, furthermore, wanting in those possibilities of exploitation that ever spurred Spain to its greatest efforts; Spain's occupation, inspired mainly by fear and jealousy of French proximity and encroachment, was hardly more than nominal. For a discussion of Spain's failures in Texas, see W. P. Webb, *The Great Plains* (New York and Boston, 1931), pp. 114-137.

The English on their part ought not to claim any part of Louisiana itself as a boundary between that province and Canada. . . . Nor are the French free to dispose of possessions the right to which Spain, as the legitimate owner, has never conceded.

Nevertheless, Wall continues significantly, as his Catholic Majesty has resolved to

coöperate in every way so as to secure a lasting peace, it would be better to fix boundaries between the several possessions as they actually exist, although up to the present time some of them may not have been recognized by Spain as unquestionably parts of the royal dominions, Louisiana and Georgia, in particular, belonging to this class.¹⁴

Grimaldi suggested on September 15 that a neutral desert zone be erected between the southern boundary of Canada (now to include eastern Louisiana) and Georgia, and also one between the remainder of Louisiana and New Spain on the west.¹⁵ Later in September, Choiseul stressed to the Spanish crown the danger of the renewal of war if Spain's objections to England's demands were not withdrawn; and as an inducement declared France's willingness to give up Louisiana altogether (though he made no actual offer as yet).¹⁶ Probably it was under these circumstances that the hypothetical boundary delimitation was arranged between France and Spain, some time in September-October, before the transfer to Spain was proposed by Choiseul to Grimaldi in November. Spain may have agreed the more readily to a Rio Grande boundary because of a hope, not unjustified, that after the return of peace France might soon cede it the province for some considera-

¹⁴ Wall to Grimaldi, August 2, 1762, in Shepherd, *op. cit.*, pp. 442, 443. Wall went on to say (again showing that up to this time Spain had made no *de jure* recognition of French Louisiana) that "I do not believe it necessary to prove the king's right to Louisiana", following this with a statement of Spain's claims to the entire lower Mississippi valley.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 444.

¹⁶ Choiseul to Ossun, September 20, 1762, and Ossun to Wall, September 27, 1762, cited in *ibid.*, p. 447 and note. Choiseul wrote Ossun: "Représentez, Monsieur, la liberté où est le Roy de céder et meme de faire évacuer ces possessions".

tion; but the evidence justifies the belief that the free gift when actually offered came as a surprise to Spain.

Louisiana may, on the other hand, have been delimited during the actual transfer to Spain—but this is less probable, not merely because the evidence points to a somewhat earlier delimitation but also because the fixing of the Rio Grande as western boundary when the province itself was being given to Spain would obviously have been unnecessary and meaningless. It could only be explained as a polite Spanish concession *in re* the old western boundary dispute¹⁷ which, if generous, would be only comparable in this respect to the magnificent French gift and would never rise to plague Spain as the permanent beneficiary. Or, it is barely possible that the crafty Louis XV. stipulated the Rio Grande with an eye to later reacquisition with interest. Not a few historians have suspected that Louis was merely pawning the province to Spain for safe-keeping in an hour of stress, to be regained when the skies again became fair. But this view is improbable; there is no evidence that the trans-Mississippi Louisiana was in any danger from England at this time. Even British greed had limits.¹⁸

¹⁷ Spain boldly claimed when negotiating long after with the United States that France had never claimed Texas before 1762, and historians have often accepted this averment as true. But France had on numerous occasions—as in 1712, 1721, and 1755-1763—laid actual claim to all or part of the Texas territory westward to the Rio Grande; and would probably have contested Spain's weak occupation vigorously had the two powers not been allies generally in European diplomacy. See Marc de Villiers, *La Louisiane: Histoire de Son Nom et de Ses Frontières Successives, 1681-1819* (Paris, 1929), pp. 51, 52; H. E. Bolton, *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century* (Berkeley, Cal., 1915), pp. 66-77, 359-364; Bolton, "French Intrusions into New Mexico", in H. M. Stephens and Bolton (eds.), *The Pacific Ocean in History* (New York, 1917), pp. 389-407. For the Spanish reaction, see C. W. Hackett, "The Policy of the Spanish Crown Regarding French Encroachments from Louisiana, 1721-1762", in *New Spain and the Anglo-American West: Historical Contributions Presented to Herbert Eugene Bolton* (Lancaster, 1932), I. 107-126.

¹⁸ However, we are told by Godoy that, about the time of the American Revolution, Vergennes used every means of persuasion "to induce Spain, already so rich in possessions beyond the sea, to give to France her ancient colony", and that Charles and Florida Blanca were not averse, but consented on the condition

The unhappy course of the war brought about an outcome with regard to the American possessions that had been little anticipated by the Bourbon Crowns when they entered into the Family Compact. In November, 1762, France was perhaps glad enough to "compensate" and gratify Spain, and gain its final consent to the peace terms, by the gift of "*tout le pays connu sous le nom de la Louisiane*", a colony which had been unprofitable. France put a higher value on Florida, and it was only after failing to induce England to accept Louisiana as indemnity instead of Florida that Choiseul offered it on November 3 to Spain, declaring, as Grimaldi wrote Wall,

that not having the faintest hope (because of the instructions which fettered Bedford) that this British Minister would accept it, his most Christian Majesty has thought to cede it to the king, who had been desiring to acquire it.¹⁹

Charles was so overcome by his kinsman's generosity that he was at first inclined to refuse the unexpected but desired gift, declaring that he could not permit Louis to suffer another loss for him.

Now we shall note the further evidence tending to show the existence itself of the hypothetical boundary agreement of that Spain be reimbursed for expenses of preserving and improving Louisiana. "The lack of money", says Godoy, "was the only difficulty which suspended the course of the negotiation". *Memorias de Don Manuel Godoy* (Paris, 1839-1841), III. 17, 18; J. B. d'Esménard (translator), *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix* (Brussels, 1836), III. 113; cited by F. J. Turner, "The Policy of France toward the Mississippi Valley", in *American Historical Review* X. 245. I am aware that late writers have discredited Turner's thesis as to French designs on the territory east of the Mississippi in the peace negotiations of 1782-1783; but the discovery that the *Mémoire Historique et Politique sur la Louisiane, par M. de Vergennes* (Paris, 1802) was a forgery does not seem sufficient reason for utterly disparaging and rejecting what Godoy says of France's desire to regain the trans-Mississippi territory. Perhaps in swinging away from Turner they have gone too far.

¹⁹ Grimaldi to Wall, November 3, 1762, quoted at length in Jerónimo Becker, "El Centenario de la Luisiana", in *La España Moderna*, No. 173, p. 111. To quote the original: ". . . había pensado el Cristianísimo cederla al Rey, que deseaba la admitiese".

1762, having conjectured as to the circumstances under which it was made. Baron de Carondelet, the Spanish Governor of Louisiana from 1791 to 1798, when later questioned as to the western boundary said:

There is no doubt but that in the archives of the government of Louisiana will be found a copy of the cession of the same by France to Spain in the year 1763, with a statement of its boundaries.

But he could not recall what the document stipulated.²⁰ The Spanish diplomat, Luis de Onís, admitted in 1818 that "the boundaries of Louisiana were fixed by the treaty of 1763-4".²¹ The last French governor, Kerlérec, was instructed by the king in 1763 to hand the province over to its new owners "in accordance with the limits fixed upon in the said preliminaries".²²

Spain's reluctance to retrocede Louisiana during the next forty years seems in part attributable to an over-generous delimitation in 1762; for, although under Spain, the old *de facto* western boundary between Natchitoches and Los Adaes continued to separate the new acquisition from New Spain, the French in repossession might change this old *de facto* situation to Spain's loss. When the question of retrocession was raised in 1769 by the Louisiana revolt, the Spanish cabinet decided that Spain should keep possession, not merely to ensure the Mississippi's being an "indelible line of demarcation between our provinces and those of the English", but to avoid a danger no less great in France. "Should this colony be ceded to France *with all its territorial enlargement*, that power might extend itself towards Mexico", declared Muniain.²³ His allusion seems only applicable to some constructive

²⁰ Carondelet to Godoy, July 21, 1807, in Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 156-161.

²¹ [Onís], *Observations on the existing Differences between the Government of Spain and the United States*, by Verus (Philadelphia, 1817), No. III. Onís's admission is discussed below in note 44.

²² B. F. French, *Historical Collections of Louisiana* (New York, 1853-1864), II. 65.

²³ Gayarré, *Louisiana*, II. 247-368, gives the cabinet discussion, which included a similar opinion on Aranda's part. The governor of Louisiana asked in 1789

"territorial enlargement", as Louisiana received no actual accretion under Spain. (West Florida, acquired some years after Muniain speaks, in 1783, was not considered or made an administrative part of Louisiana.)

For Spain no trouble would have arisen if in 1800 the ambitious Corsican had not procured Spain's promise to retrocede the colony "with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it . . .". The King of Spain having given final consent to the retrocession on October 15, 1802, Napoleon informed his intended agent to Louisiana, through instructions from the minister of marine on November 26, that the province extended from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande. Some reputable historians have perceived in this an absolute proof that Texas was included in the Louisiana which we bought from France, since Napoleon would undoubtedly have occupied Texas had his imperial schemes progressed.²⁴ Professor E. C. Barker, more scrupulous, replies for those who have believed Napoleon's claim unfounded and purely arbitrary:

But most of us are unwilling, fortunately, to dismiss the question so summarily. Ownership and occupation prior to 1763 seem a fairer basis for determining the question than Napoleon's intention in 1802. If France did not own and occupy Texas before 1763, it did not cede the territory to Spain; if Spain did not receive it from France, it did not recede it; and France, in consequence, did not sell it to the United

for a slight extension westward of the *de facto* line to the Sabine, but it was not made. Bolton, *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century*, pp. 1, 2; E. L. Portillo, *Apuntes para la Historia de Coahuila y Texas* (Saltillo, 1886), p. 338. My italics in text above.

²⁴ Edward Channing says: "Napoleon sold us Louisiana, and we became possessed of Louisiana, simply and solely because he held the Spanish monarchy by the throat. Whatever he meant to take possession of under the name of Louisiana, he intended to hand over to us and handed over to us". Channing, *History of the United States* (New York, 1905-1925), IV. 331-333. Similarly, Adams, *History of the United States*, II. 5-7. These writers have been criticized because they did not go behind and try to justify Napoleon's claim.

States. No one who reads Pichardo's monumental brief can doubt that Spain and not France owned Texas in 1763 and thereafter.²⁵

Napoleon's claim to Texas was apparently not without foundation. His instructions of November 26, 1802, for the occupation of Louisiana point distinctly to an early boundary treaty:

The extent of Louisiana is well determined . . . on the west by the river called *Rio Bravo*, from its mouth to the thirtieth degree, but its line of demarcation has not been traced beyond the latter point and it appears that no convention has ever been held concerning this part of the frontier. The farther north one goes, the more indecisive becomes the boundary. That part of America scarcely includes more than uninhabited forests or Indian tribes, and hitherto no necessity has been felt of establishing a line of demarcation.²⁶

These instructions merely repeat a memorandum sent to Decrés on October 2 by Talleyrand, whose official knowledge went far back into the monarchy:

I shall indicate to you the boundaries of Louisiana which have been traced with some precision. The treaty of 1763, of which I send you an extract (enclosure no. 2) provides that the eastern boundary of that colony must follow the middle of the Mississippi. . . . A part of the boundaries of New Mexico and Louisiana is determined with some precision. The Rio Bravo, from its mouth up to the 30th degree, serves as the line of demarcation. But from that last point the line is less exact. It does not appear that any convention of boundaries was ever held for that part of the frontier. The farther north one goes, the more vague is the demarcation. . . . Neither has any line been drawn between Louisiana and Canada. Since both of those countries belonged to France before the treaty of 1763, there was little to be gained in separating exactly their boundaries, and that has not since been done, for the same reasons that caused the demarca-

²⁵ Barker's review of *Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana*, edited by C. W. Hackett (Austin, Tex., 1931-), in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XXXV. 243. On Pichardo's work see, below, note 41.

²⁶ Decrés to Victor, November 26, 1802, in Robertson, *Louisiana*, I. 361-363; Adams, *History*, II. 6 (my italics).

*tion of part of the wilderness of Louisiana and New Mexico to be neglected.*²⁷

Talleyrand's language seems to imply that he cites and sends to Decrès a Franco-Spanish treaty demarking Louisiana, as well as the peace treaty of 1763. Further instructions to Victor, of December 9, 1802, clearly imply that the definition of San Ildefonso was implicit, not indefinite:

Le traité de Saint Ildefonse a donné a la Louisiane pour délimitation, la rivière Bravo depuis son embouchure jusqu'au 30e degré Nord, d'où la ligne de démarcation est indéterminée vers le Nord-Ouest, ainsi que toutes celles du Nord, qui se perdent dans les vastes solitudes dénuées d'établissements européens.²⁸

Similarly, Talleyrand writes in November, 1804, in his "Report to the Emperor on Monroe's 'Memoir on the Floridas'" (which is devoted exclusively to combatting the American claim to West Florida):

The limits of Louisiana were not literally recalled in the treaty of San Ildefonso of October 1, 1800, but to know them it was only

²⁷ Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 141 (my italics). The original French (given by J. R. Ficklen, "Was Texas Included in the Louisiana Purchase?" in *Pubs. of the Southern Historical Assn.*, V. 383, 384) follows: "Une partie des limites du Nouveau Mexique et de la Louisiane est déterminée avec assez de précision. Le Rio Bravo, en le remontant depuis son embouchure jusque vers le 30 degré, sert de ligne de démarcation, mais depuis ce demi-point la ligne est moins exact. Il ne paraît pas qu'il y ait eu de convention de limites sur cette partie de la frontière. Plus en avance vers le nord, plus la démarcation doit être incertaine. . . ."

It is interesting that these domestic French documents first appeared in American prints in 1845, and had some influence in the concluding phase of Texas annexation and the pre-Mexican War period. They were procured with other documents of historic interest from the French Archives of Marine by Governor Alexander Mouton of Louisiana, acting under a state act of 1844-1845, and appeared in the New Orleans papers, thence spreading over the country and giving comfort to the Texas "re-annexationists". The American minister to Texas, A. J. Donelson, seeing Decrès's instructions to Victor in the *New Orleans Courier*, transmitted them to the state department on July 11, 1845, and published them in Texas, in the *Telegraph and Texas Register* (Houston), July 16, 1845. Talleyrand's earlier memorandum may be found in the *Democratic Statesman* (Nashville), June 7, 1845, p. 137, quoted from the *New Orleans Courier*.

²⁸ Villiers, *La Louisiane*, p. 61.

necessary to consult the prior treaties. France, who had possessed Louisiana until 1762 and who had then ceded it to Spain, had included in the cession only the western bank of the Mississippi and the isle of New Orleans. . . . By the preliminaries of peace signed the same day with England and confirmed some months later. . . . France ceded to England all that she possessed on the eastern bank of the Mississippi.²⁹

Again, Pinckney's Secretary of Legation at Madrid, John Graham, wrote Secretary Madison on November 29, 1802 that he had learned (probably from the French Ambassador, St. Cyr) that the boundaries of Louisiana had been laid down by treaty of 1762. St. Cyr had specified in his formal pledge to Spain in July, 1802, that France was acquiring the gulf region westward *to the Rio Grande*, and would never alienate it—short-lived promise!³⁰ Talleyrand, similarly, informed General Turreau, the French ambassador at Washington, in 1805: The western boundary of Louisiana ceded to the United States was determined by the convention of 1762, which at that time caused that territory to pass to Spain. It is from that that they derive all their rights as to actual possessors.³¹

Holding the Rio Grande to the thirtieth parallel so indisputable a boundary that Spain could take no exception, seemingly, France merely wished to negotiate a northward extension of this line so as to separate the upper part of Louisiana definitely from Spanish New Mexico. A draft of an intended treaty with Spain, of October 18, 1802, dealing with the ces-

²⁹ "Les limites de la Louisiane n'étaient littéralement rappelées dans le traité de Saint-Ildefonse du 8 vendémiaire An IX; mais il suffisait pour les connaître de consulter les traités antérieurs. . . ." F. P. Renault, *La Question de la Louisiane* (Paris, 1918), p. 230. My italics above.

³⁰ Graham to Madison, November 29, 1802, Spanish Dispatches, MSS., VI. Bureau of Indexes and Archives, State Department; cited in Cox, *The West Florida Controversy*, p. 70. On St. Cyr, see F. A. Ogg, *The Opening of the Mississippi* (New York, 1904), p. 484; Cox, in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XVII. 10.

³¹ "La limite occidentale de la Louisiane cédée aux Etats-Unis a été déterminée par la convention de 1762. . . ." Talleyrand to Turreau, April 26, 1805, in Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 142 note. I am deeply indebted for the above transcript of the original French to Professor Robertson.

sion of European territory and the transfer of the Floridas, provides, in Article VIII, that joint commissioners shall make this extension of the western boundary:

Pour déterminer avec précision la ligne de démarcation . . . on prendra pour limites entre la Louisiane et le Royaume de Mexico le milieu du fleuve del Norte en le remontant depuis son embouchure jusqu'au 29e degré. Des commissaires nommés de part et d'autre traceront depuis ce dernier point la ligne de démarcation entre la Louisiane et Nouveau Mexique et la California.³²

France's definite views respecting the western boundary are displayed again in the French *projet* of 1803 for an American treaty. Promising France's future good offices, Article X states:

Les limites de la Louisiane du côté du Nouveau Mexique seront réglées amiablement entre l'Espagne et les Etats-Unis, de manière que tous les lieux et territoires qui font actuellement partie du Nouveau Mexique continuent d'y être réunis et que plus au Nord la ligne de limite suive le sommet le plus élevé des montagnes qui terminent a l'Ouest le bassin du Missouri jusqu'au premiers établissements anglais.³³

In mentioning no territory between Mexico and Louisiana, no disputed frontier but the New Mexican, this seems to assume the inclusion of Texas in Louisiana. The actual Purchase treaty, based upon Livingston's draft, of course contains no such suggestive wording.

It would seem from all the foregoing that a convention of 1762 (whether that of cession to Spain or one just before) had fixed the Mississippi as eastern boundary and the Rio Grande to the twenty-ninth or thirtieth parallel as western, presumably designating the mouth of the Pecos on the upper Rio Grande as the northern stopping point. Four years before this the Frenchman Du Pratz had traced the western limit on

³² The draft is quoted from the French Archives in Renault, *La Question de la Louisiane*, p. 95.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 220, 221.

his map along the Rio Grande to 29° 25', thence running it west about forty miles and taking it north parallel to the Pecos to about the forty-first parallel.³⁴ This map, in Du Pratz's *Histoire de Louisiane* (1758), may have served to guide the French in 1762—the latter part of his line, infringing on the New Mexican towns, being left open.³⁵

Though historians have justly deemed Spain's claims to Texas, by occupation, greatly superior to those of France as put forth by our diplomats, the evidence shows Spain quite submissive when the French declared Texas a part of regained Louisiana, and it is improbable that Spain would have failed to protest a claim which it felt unjustified. It was only when the United States became possessor of the French title that Spain, enlisting France on its side, discovered that consciousness of its immaculate right to Texas which has so impressed historians.³⁶ French and Spanish statesmen knew much more about the boundary matter than was vouchsafed to the American purchasers, and Spain's course was guided accordingly.

³⁴ Cox, "The Louisiana-Texas Frontier", in *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Assn.*, X. 20; T. M. Marshall, *The Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase* (Berkeley, 1914), p. 5.

³⁵ The French De Lisle map of 1707 traced the boundary along the Rio Grande to the mouth of the Pecos, thence north, excluding the New Mexican settlements. The Spanish map of 1762 made by Lopez, geographer to the king of Spain, likewise gave the Rio Grande in its lower course as the boundary. See Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 36. Champigny's *Etat Present de la Louisiane* (1781) mentions the twenty-ninth parallel, but with what meaning is not clear: "What remained to France of her vast province of Louisiana [after the cession to England] comprised a vast strip eighty leagues from east to west from the mouth of the Mississippi to Mexico. The Rio Bravo del Norte on the west and the Mississippi on the east bounded these possessions, which extended from twenty-nine degrees north latitude to fifty degrees and even beyond". French, *op. cit.*, V. 128.

³⁶ See *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XXXV. 103-105. Perhaps rumors, if not authentic knowledge, of the agreement of 1762 went about shortly after, for the Rio Grande was stated as the boundary in several publications of the time. One was Alcedo's *Diccionario Geographico Historico* of 1783, which was cited by Secretary J. Q. Adams in his Spanish negotiations. *Niles' Register* (Baltimore), XIV. 88. Professor Barker calls to my attention that the Rio Grande is given also in Thomas Salmon's *Geographical Grammar*, published in Kilmarnock, Scotland, in 1767. See *Dallas Morning News*, March 27, 1932.

When the imperialistic Americans asked Napoleon's agent, Laussat, what the limits of their purchase were, he read freely the Consul's description, so ample to the west. That he had received no admonition to be reticent seems to show Talleyrand's indifference at first as to the publicity likely to be given the French boundary claim. Laussat's expansive description irritated Spain's local officers in the new world, who were exclusively impressed by the fact of the Spanish occupation of Texas and protested against Laussat's support of the Americans' "absurd claim". Laussat replied that he merely quoted his instructions (which were those originally intended for Victor). Displaying none of this zeal and assurance of its American officials, the Spanish administration was reticent. Cevallos, the foreign minister, remonstrated to Talleyrand against Laussat's indiscretion and entreated him to discourage the American claim to Texas. He did not deny its justice, thus "tacitly yielding it", as it seemed to Henry Adams, whom French and Spanish artfulness impressed.³⁶ Talleyrand was accommodating, and instructed Turreau at Washington "to dissuade the United States from the idea of attempting to extend the boundaries of Louisiana towards the west and northwest, in such a way as to cause annoyance to the court of Madrid". Even when selling Louisiana, France had given but vague encouragement to the Americans' broad views as to its extent, having no desire gratuitously to please a distant republic at the expense of a possible European ally or vassal. So, telling Livingston that Spain meant to give France possession "according to the words of the treaty", he uttered the evasive and laconic challenge: "You have made a noble bargain for yourselves and I suppose you will make the most of it". When further pressed, Talleyrand added that France *would have construed* "her claim to boundaries liberally"³⁷ Though soon after this the United States was calmly

³⁶ Adams, *History*, II. 298.

³⁷ *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II. 561, 574, 575; Barbé Marbois, *History of Louisiana* (Philadelphia, 1830), p. 286; *Southwestern Historical*

given to think that France would only have taken a rather eastern limit on the west, France never really denied the claim to Texas as she did that to West Florida. Clearly the chief French concern was to prevent the Americans from claiming the Spanish New Mexican territory east of the Rio Grande but northwest of Texas.³⁸ As late as 1805, Secretary Madison still looked to France for assistance:

What part France may take in relation to the western boundary of Louisiana seems not to have been disclosed. From the silence on that point, in Talleyrand's note of November 8, in answer to yours, in which the claim of the United States to the Rio Bravo is expressly asserted, and from the confidential acknowledgment of that boundary by M. Laussat, . . . it might be expected that . . . France would side with us again Spain.³⁹

In the meanwhile Talleyrand seems to mark out an agreeable course for Spain to pursue—on the theory that if France had kept Louisiana

We should have sought to distinguish between settlements that belong to the kingdom of Mexico, and settlements . . . by the French. This distinction between settlements founded by the French or by the Spaniards would have been made equally in ascending northwards.

If this was intended to help Spain, as historians have assumed, it must have been merely to stress the friendship of France that Talleyrand prefaced this suggestion to the Spanish ambassador with a seeming reminder that the question

Quarterly, XVII. 10, 20; *American Historical Review*, XXXIII. 356, 357; Monroe to Gallatin, June 1, 1816, in S. M. Hamilton (ed.), *The Writings of James Monroe* (New York, 1898-1903), V. 385; Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 162-172, 150 ff.

³⁸ Talleyrand to Turreau, August 8, 1804, in Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 193, 194; Talleyrand to Turreau, February 3, 1805, cited by Cox, in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XVII. 174. Cf. Marbois, *Louisiana*, p. 285; Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 34. J. Q. Adams noted: "But when France had sold her bargain to us . . . she changed her tone—first equivocated and evaded, and finally declared herself point-blank against us upon the eastern limit, and more feebly and ambiguously upon the western". C. F. Adams (ed.), *The Memoirs of John Quincy Adams* (Philadelphia, 1874-1877), IV. 220, 221.

³⁹ Madison to Monroe, May 23, 1805, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, II. 633.

was not innocent of some early milestone. After mentioning the eastern limit, he said:

Since the western boundary of Louisiana was not fixed *in so precise a manner by the treaties* preceding that of March 21, 1801, nor by that treaty itself, the uncertainty that could exist *on the direction* of its frontiers must have still remained since the cession to the United States. France even could not take it upon itself to indicate to the United States what that precise boundary must be, for fear of wounding in this regard the rights or pretensions of one or the other of the powers directly interested in that question. It would have become the object of a negotiation between his Imperial Majesty and his Catholic Majesty.⁴⁰

Now it is not improbable that Talleyrand merely meant that the test of actual settlement would have been applied only above the mouth of the Pecos on the Rio Grande, to determine the "direction" of the boundary, as had been his plain intention in 1802. But Spain seized on the opportunity for equivocation so cleverly left open, and urged, in treating with the Americans, that France had expressly intended the *de facto* test to be used to determine *the whole* of the western limit.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Talleyrand to Gravina, August 30, 1804, in Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 195-198; Adams, *History*, II. 299, 300 (my italics). The treaty of March 21, 1801, merely confirmed that of San Ildefonso.

⁴¹ Cevallos to the American envoys, April 20, 1805, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, II. 663. In May, 1805, Cevallos ordered the compilation of Spain's claims to Texas by exploration and occupation; and the resulting compendium, made by Talamantes and Pichardo, is being edited by Professor C. W. Hackett as *Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas* (Austin, 1931-). During his search for germane documents and information, Talamantes wrote to Governor Carondelet, now at Quito; Carondelet's response we have noted above. Talamantes to Carondelet, Mexico, April 1, 1807, and Carondelet to Talamantes, Quito, July 21, 1807, in Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 156-161.

It was not Spain's intent that Talamantes and his successor in the work, Pichardo, should present unfavorable facts, so it may be presumed that Carondelet's ghostly disclosure never reached Talamantes, since it was addressed through Godoy in Spain. This suppression is eloquent of Spanish policy. *Pichardo's Treatise* (of which one volume is published now) asserts boldly that the boundaries of Louisiana had never been fixed—the indispensable premise of Spain's claim to Texas by occupation as presented to the United States.

Talleyrand's explanation to Turreau in 1805 that the Franco-American title rested on the treaty of 1762, by which "the western boundary . . . was determined", might seem a curious avowal if France still meant to support Spain by reticence. But, though temporarily equivocating, France would gladly aid the Americans in this matter if it should be profitable. Napoleon, who could envision the "sale" of the Floridas to the United States and the vassalage of Spain itself, had no generous scruple against divulging a boundary secret; but what he desired in return from the Americans was a *douceur*, as usual. Livingston reported:

While Spain wishes to limit us as much as possible, France wishes to make our controversy favorable to her finances. Yesterday Marbois again spoke to me on the subject of purchasing the Floridas and giving sixty millions for them.

Monroe was similarly advised when he passed through Paris to Madrid: "Spain must cede territory; the United States must pay money".⁴² And thus in the spring of 1805 "the order of Decrès and the interpretation of Talleyrand regarding the limits of Louisiana were both used in an attempt to bargain with the United States"⁴³—the secret of 1762 then being disclosed to Turreau doubtless for that purpose. But President Jefferson, while eager to pay for an extension of Louisiana eastward, was not anxious to pay for aid in the remote western claim, and let slip what was possibly the great opportunity to ensure the early, peaceable possession of

⁴² Livingston to Monroe, September 21, 1804, in Hamilton (ed.), *Writings of Monroe*, IV. 305 note; H. B. Fuller, *The Purchase of Florida* (Cleveland, 1906), pp. 158, 159.

⁴³ Quoting Cox, "The Significance of the Louisiana-Texas Frontier", in *Procs. of the Miss. Valley Hist. Assn.*, III. 207, where Monroe papers of March, 1805, are cited. As late as 1812 Napoleon's foreign minister, the Duc de Bassano, "said that if the United States persisted in its refusal to discuss West Florida as an offset to the spoiliations, he might use the unsettled western boundary as an additional incentive. . . . Spain might now be willing to relinquish the claims to the Bravo". Cox, *The West Florida Controversy*, p. 570, citing the French Archives.

Texas. Jefferson had barely a clue to the secret. Secretary Madison wrote the American envoys that he found in a *Life of Chatham* printed at London for I. S. Gordon in 1793

a memorial referred to . . . with the other negotiations preceding the peace of 1762-3, expressly on the subjects of the limits of Louisiana. . . . You will perhaps be able to procure in London or Paris a sight of this document: it probably contains most of the proofs applicable to the question, and will be more important as proceeding from France.⁴⁴

"Madison to Monroe and Pinckney, April 15, 1804, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, II. 629; Gaillard Hunt (ed.), *The Writings of James Madison* (New York, 1900-1910), VII. 148, 149. Probably such memorial, however, would have been found to deal only with the eastern boundary against Canada. General Wilkinson, who had the confidence of many Spanish officials during his shady career, claimed to know in 1804 that the Río Grande had been "determined as the western boundary". Robertson, *Louisiana*, II. 336, 337; on Wilkinson's authorship of the document cited see Cox, in *American Historical Review*, XIX. 798 note.

In 1764, on returning from Louisiana, Governor Kerlérec wrote a memoir on his administration and the state of the province at the request of the French king (see Surrey, *op. cit.*, II. 1462, 1464). Very likely it described the *de facto* extent of French territory. Onis mentioned this Kerlérec memoir to Secretary Adams during the negotiation of 1818 as being an official "supplement to the act of cession" and as supporting his averment that France had "never ventured to go beyond the certain and well-known limits of their settlements, or violate those of the territory and dominions of Spain". This was but one of Onis's many prevarications, some of which Adams saw through clearly. For instance, Onis boldly maintained that the cession of Louisiana to Spain had occurred in 1764—this to enable him at once to emphasize that West Florida, ceded to England in 1763, could not have formed part of the Louisiana given Spain the *next year* and to link up the cession with Kerlérec's report of 1764. But Adams, knowing this dating to be fictitious, called Onis's bluff, pointing out that hitherto Spain had declared that the boundaries had never been fixed, while now Onis suddenly says that they had been fixed, though he gives no adequate proof or information. A memoir of 1764 which could not be produced must be considered of no significance, said Adams. Onis was now sorry that he had tried to bluff, and retreated into the old discussion of *de facto* boundaries and their "notoriety", seeking to hush up his admission that they had been fixed. Adams might have pursued his inquisition into the Spaniard's duplicity and deceit, but General Jackson's invasion of Florida absorbed attention at this point. Onis to Adams, January 5, and March 23, 1818, and Adams to Onis, March 12, 1818, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, IV. 459, 484, 475; cf. Onis in *ibid.*, IV. 453, 454, 457; Onis, *Memoria sobre las negociaciones entre España y los Estados Unidos* (Madrid, 1820), appendix, quoted in Vicente Filisola, *Memorias para la Historia de la Guerra de Texas*

Jefferson disparaged his one bit of substantial information—Laussat's disclosure at New Orleans—because it was unfavorable to his treasured claim to West Florida: "We cannot suppose that the French prefect, M. Laussat, had any instructions from his Government by what limits he was to receive the province of Louisiana from the officers of Spain".⁴⁵ France's endeavor to hush up Decrès's instructions, in order to check the Americans on the west, had ironically comforted them in their erroneous eastern claim. Livingston wrote Madison on July 30, 1803:

I this day got a sight of a letter from the Minister to Laussat, containing directions for giving up the country, and assigning reasons for the cession. I was much flattered to find the reasons wholly drawn from the memoir I had presented; and that the order for the cession was full, and *contained no other description of the country than that which had been designated in the Treaty of St. Ildefonso; so that I hope you have not failed to insist on West Florida.*⁴⁶

For fifteen years after 1803 the United States and Spain were at odds over Texas and West Florida, the weight of France being thrown on Spain's side; and those who believed that we *ceded* Texas to Spain for Florida in 1819 were perhaps more right than they knew, so that the term "re-annexation" springing up thereafter may not have been inherently improper. Onís suggested in 1816, on beginning the negotiation that led to the Florida treaty, that Spain "might be willing to cede territory on the eastern side of the Mississippi in satisfaction of claims and *in exchange* for territory on the western side". And in his account of the negotiation he said he might truthfully have put into the treaty ceding Florida this clause: "In exchange, the United States cede to his Majesty (Mexico, 1849), I. 35, 36. With regard to Kerlérec's probable views on the western limit, it may be noted that he had considerable strife with the Spanish officials over his aggressive intrusions into Texas. See Bolton, *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century*, pp. 359-364.

⁴⁵ Pinckney and Monroe to Cevallos, March 8, 1805, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, II. 655.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, II. 567 (my italics).

esty the province of Texas". But, he continues, "as I had, in the correspondence . . . for three years contended that that province belonged to the King, it would have been a contradiction" too stultifying!⁴⁷ Hyde de Neuville, Bourbon France's ambassador at Washington, who acted as a friendly mediator, told Adams in November, 1818, that

Onís wanted him to interpose . . . in favor of Spain, but intimated that he had declined, and told him that if he did give a declaration it would displease both parties, for it would be against the United States upon the Florida and French consular points, and against Spain on the western boundary.⁴⁸

Adams knew that Onís was authorized to yield all of Texas, indeed all the territory to the Rio Grande, if necessary;⁴⁹ but the United States yielded its claim—at least provisionally—at this time, not so much because it was really necessary to gain the Floridas, but because of the "difficulties of an internal nature which menace the Union itself", namely, the great sectional struggle over Missouri admission, 1818-1820.

Scholars now agree that the West Florida claim was ill-

⁴⁷ Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 50 (my italics); Onís, *Memoir upon the Negotiations between Spain and the United States* (Baltimore, 1821), pp. 146, 147. President Monroe said in his message of December 7, 1819: "For territory ceded by Spain, other territory of great value, to which our claim was believed to be well founded, was ceded by the United States".

⁴⁸ C. F. Adams (ed.), *Memoirs of J. Q. Adams*, IV. 169. The later assumption by "re-annexationists" that Monroe and Adams had claimed the Rio Grande in its whole course was probably gratuitous. "I utterly deny", said Adams, "that I claimed the Rio del Norte in its full extent. I only claimed it a short distance up the river, and then diverged northward". *Congressional Globe*, 29 Cong., 1 Sess., App. 907; indeed, see Adams to Onís, March 12, 1818, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, IV. 471. Marshall assumes the Rio Grande in its entire course to have been Adams's proposal (*op. cit.*, p. 55 and map opposite p. 66).

⁴⁹ Adams to Forsyth, August 18, 1819, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, IV. 245, 250; Adams in *Niles' Register*, LXVII. 108. It has been thought unnecessary before in this discussion, because the fact is so well known, to mention that "Texas" was purely a Spanish term and jurisdiction, bounded on the west by the Nueces, and that the application of the term to the whole of the land between the Sabine and the Rio Grande is incorrect and only used as a rough approximation for convenience; the distinction has no significance for this paper.

founded, and it seems the majority and best opinion that our statesmen in urging it were more patriotic than scrupulous.⁵⁰ But Professor E. C. Barker believes they may have been honest, and points out that there was at least enough ground in the obscurity for a lawyer's brief, a Spanish Governor of West Florida repeatedly speaking of his province as "that part of Louisiana which we still retain".⁵¹ Indeed, H. M. Brackenridge, an early student of the Purchase, would assure us:

The Opelousas, Attakapas, Washita, were not delivered to M. Laussat any more than Baton Rouge, or Mobile. *But it is a well known fact in Louisiana, that the Spaniards, at these last-mentioned posts, had actually prepared to deliver them up, and that their refusal to do so, was an after-thought. . . . To France they would not have been refused.*⁵²

Up to the signing of the Purchase treaty Livingston had frequently assured his government that France had not received any of the Floridas with or after Louisiana.⁵³ Yet after signing he reported that he found in the peculiar definition of Louisiana repeated in our treaty that we had acquired a claim to West Florida—"without knowing it", says Henry Adams, who thus voices the customary view that it was an afterthought. Is this quite accurate? Instructed to buy West Florida, could Livingston return empty-handed? (He esteemed Louisiana so little as to advise his government on April 11, 1803, to exchange it for the Floridas if acquired!)

⁵⁰ Cox, *The West Florida Controversy*, pp. 64-101; H. E. Chambers, "West Florida and Its Relation to the Historical Cartography of the United States", in *Johns Hopkins Studies*, XVI. No. 5 (Baltimore, 1898), pp. 41, 42.

⁵¹ Barker, "On the Historiography of American Territorial Expansion", in J. F. Willard (ed.), *The Trans-Mississippi West* (Boulder, Colo., 1931), p. 223.

⁵² Brackenridge, "The Florida Question Stated", in *The American Register*, I, 128-148 (Philadelphia, 1817). The author of *Views of Louisiana* (Philadelphia, 1816) wrote this Florida piece in reply to Onis's *Verus* pamphlet mentioned above, note 21. Italics in original.

⁵³ See references in note 50; also, Livingston in *Am. Stat. Pap., For. Rel.*, II, 519, 579; Rufus King to Livingston, April 12, 1803, in C. R. King (ed.), *The Correspondence of Rufus King* (New York, 1894-1900), IV, 246.

It has often been assumed that Napoleon was responsible for the repetition of the "ambiguous" definition of 1800 in our treaty of May 1, 1803, moved again by some such calculation as desire to embroil us with Spain or to profit from future mediation. But it would seem, instead, that the San Ildefonso wording was inserted in our treaty at the wish and request of the American negotiators, notably Livingston. Marbois's French *projet* for a treaty did not contain the elaborate definition.⁵⁴ The Americans at first demanded an explicit statement of limits, but Marbois was entirely ignorant of the whole question and could not help. Monroe and Livingston were then anxious for a "guaranty" that the United States would receive all of Louisiana that France had recovered; this was stressed in Livingston's counter-*projet*. The idea was soon abandoned as impractical. It was as such a precautionary measure, however, *if not something deeper*, that Livingston desired Marbois to incorporate in our treaty the exact terms of the treaty of San Ildefonso. "Marbois", wrote Monroe in his diary-journal,

had no objection to inserting the art: of the treaty of Il defonso by which France acquired the territory, in our treaty, & would make her good offices with Spain in support of our negotiations for the Floridas.⁵⁵

Marbois says in his later narrative that he urged the Americans not to insist on definite limits but

to abide by a general stipulation, and, since these territories are still at this day for the most part in the possession of the Indians, await

⁵⁴ Marbois's *projet* of April 22, 1803 (in Renault, *La Louisiane*, p. 219) ceded Louisiana in general terms: "The colony or province of Louisiana is ceded by France to the United States, with all its rights and appurtenances, as fully and in the same manner as they have been acquired by the French republic, by virtue of the third article of the treaty concluded with his Catholic Majesty at St. Ildephonso, on the 1st of October, 1800". The wording of Napoleon's original *projet*, which Marbois modified and superseded by his own, is even more general. J. B. P. Vaillant and other editors, *Correspondence de Napoleon* (Paris, 1858-1870), VIII. 365.

⁵⁵ Hamilton (ed.), *Writings of Monroe*, IV. 13-16.

future arrangements, or leave the matter for the treaty stipulations the United States may make with them and Spain.

Thus entreating, Marbois showed the Americans the wording of the long-hidden treaty of San Ildefonso, and his account of the seductive effect which this produced on those hitherto reluctant gentlemen is again indicative of their aroused interest, which he clearly sensed:

Whether the American plenipotentiaries had themselves desired what was proposed to them [*i.e.*, a general stipulation], *or that these words afforded them a ray of light*, they declared that they kept to the terms of the 3d article of the treaty of St. Ildephonso, which was inserted entire in the first article of the treaty of cession. M. Marbois, who offered the draft, said several times: "The first article may in time give rise to difficulties, they are at this day insurmountable; but if they do not stop you, I, at least, desire that your government should know that you have been warned of them". It is in fact important not to introduce ambiguous clauses into treaties; however, *the American plenipotentiaries made so more objections, and if, in appearing to be resigned to these general terms through necessity, they considered them really preferable to more precise stipulations, it must be admitted that the event has justified their foresight. . . .*

The French negotiator, in rendering an account of the conference to the first consul, pointed out to him the obscurity of this article *and the inconveniences of so uncertain a stipulation*. He replied, "that if an obscurity did not already exist, it would perhaps be good policy to put one there".⁵⁶

So far, then, from Napoleon, or the patently reluctant and conscientious Marbois, having instigated the incorporation of the "ambiguous" definition in the purchase treaty, Napoleon merely gave an *after-approval* by his oft-quoted cynical expression. At once perceiving therein the means for future bargaining with the United States and Spain, he was naturally well satisfied.

⁵⁶ Marbois, *Louisiana*, pp. 283-286 (French text, pp. 307-311). Cf. Monroe to Gallatin, June 1, 1816, in Hamilton (ed.), *Writings of Monroe*, V. 385. *My italics.*

Now Louisiana with the extent "it had when France possessed it" might well suggest the inclusion of West Florida to one who knew nothing of its delimitation in 1762. Nevertheless, Livingston's "discovery" that we acquired a claim to West Florida is remarkable considering his previous certainty, on good grounds, that France had failed in its efforts to gain the Floridas in 1802-1803, in its negotiations at Madrid. We have reason to believe, in short, that he procured the insertion of the words of the earlier treaty in ours with a deliberate view to the claim to West Florida he makes so soon, a claim which would fulfill his instructions. It is improbable that he had learned previously the precise terms of San Ildefonso, but he had long since viewed the Franco-Spanish Florida negotiations as merely a "difference of opinion" as to the extent of the territory meant to be conveyed to France by the treaty of 1800—a divergence of interpretation "relative to the meaning of Louisiana, which has been understood by France to include the Floridas, but probably by Spain to have been confined to the strict meaning of the term".⁵⁷ With this impression he could naturally see the usefulness of the San Ildefonso phraseology at first glance when Marbois produced it. Indeed, he says as much when, on May 20, he first announced the claim to his government. He says that before the treaty he had disbelieved that any of the Floridas had been included,

because I understood that Louisiana, as it then was, made the object of the cession; and that since the possession of the Floridas by Britain, they had changed their names. But the moment I saw the words of the Treaty of Madrid I had no doubt but it included all the country that France possessed by the name of Louisiana, previous to the cession to Spain, except what had been conveyed by subsequent treaties. *I accordingly insisted, with M. Marbois, at the time we negotiated,*

⁵⁷ Livingston to Madison, May 28, 1802, in *State Papers and Correspondence bearing upon the Purchase of the Territory of Louisiana* (Washington, 1903), p. 29.

that this would be considered as within our purchase. He neither assented nor denied.⁵⁸

Livingston thus had the strongest of motives for obtaining the incorporation of the "ambiguous" definition in the purchase treaty!

The more scrupulous Monroe was passive and uncertain about this. Skeptical of the "discovery", he wrote Monroe that it would be well to make a thorough study of authentic documents before suggesting any course to their government, to be assured that "it was founded in principles of Justice such as could be demonstrated".⁵⁹ But this was after Livingston had already addressed the proposed claim to the Virginian administrators, who immediately found it acceptable.

The West Florida claim, though rebuked by France and Spain and discredited by Jefferson himself in his devious efforts to purchase through France, was too convenient to forget; and President Madison revived and enforced it when revolution broke out in West Florida in 1810. Probably Madison acted alone, by proclamation of annexation, because congress, bristling with hostile northern federalists, could not be counted on to annex that *southern* territory on his mere recommendation, certainly not with immature precipitancy disregarding Spain's lingering rights and feelings. In thus moving alone, he could only justify the measure—even more flagrantly unconstitutional if it brought war—upon the ground that he was merely extending jurisdiction over territory already belonging to us. Hence, doubtless, the heavy stress on the Louisiana claim in his proclamation of October 27, 1810, which almost indecently ignored the self-determined "Republic" set up at Baton Rouge. Then, too, the British danger called for hasty action, in Madison's opinion.

It may not be wholly supererogative to suggest that this imperialistic policy partly inspired Madison's non-intercourse

⁵⁸ Livingston to Madison, private, May 20, 1803, in *ibid.*, p. 200 (my italics).

⁵⁹ Hamilton (ed.), *Writings of Monroe*, IV. 40-43.

proclamation against England of November 2, a step in the drift toward the "Second War" which has somewhat puzzled students. The customary explanation, found again in Napoleon's overwhelming chicanery and "deceptiveness", this time in the noted Cadore letter of August 5, 1810, seems open to question. Alluding to Macon bill No. 2 of May, the French minister stated to our ambassador, Armstrong:

Congress engages to oppose itself to that one of the belligerent Powers which should refuse to acknowledge the rights of neutrals.

In this new state of things, I am authorized to declare to you, sir, that the decrees of Berlin and Milan are revoked, and that after the 1st of November they will cease to have effect; it being well understood that, in consequence of this declaration, the English shall revoke their orders in council, and renounce the new principles of blockade, which they have wished to establish; or that the United States, conformably to the act you have just communicated, shall cause their rights to be respected by the English. . . . The independence of America is one of the principle titles of glory to France. Since that epoch, the Emperor is pleased in aggrandizing the United States.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Champigny, Duc de Cadore, to John Armstrong, August 5, 1810, in *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, III. 386, 387. Though the conditions of the contingent offer were to be "well understood" and seem plain enough, yet the present tense in the first clause has been viewed by historians as a deliberate, deceptive ambiguity framed by a cunning Napoleon. That the emperor's instructions to Cadore, July 31, 1810, on which Cadore based his letter, does not have the "obscurity" of Cadore's letter, but makes it clear throughout that the revocation is future and conditional, has not been noted. Napoleon writes Cadore: "Monsieur, . . . après avoir beaucoup réfléchi sur les affaires d'Amerique, j'ai pensé que rapporter mes décrets . . . n'auront aucun effet; qu'il valait mieux que vous fassiez une note à M. Armstrong, par laquelle vous lui feriez connaître que vous m'avez mis sous les yeux les détails contenu dans la gazette américaine; que j'aurais désiré avoir une communication plus officielle, mais que le temps se passe, et que puisqu'il assure qu'on peut regarder cela comme officielle, il peut compter que mes décrets . . . n'auront aucun effet à dater du 1^{er} novembre, et qu'il doit les considérer comme rapportés en consequence de tel acte du congrès américain, à condition que, si le conseil britannique ne rapporte pas ses arrêts de 1807, le congrès des Etats-Unis remplira l'engagement qu'il a pris de rétablir ses prohibitions sur le commerce de l'Angleterre. Cela me paraît plus convenable qu'un décret qui ferait secousse et ne remplirait pas mon but. Cette méthode me paraît plus conforme à ma dignité et au sérieux de l'affaire." *Correspondence de Napoleon*, XX. 644, 645. In all his remarks on the subject

In late response Madison issued his proclamation against England, declaring that France *had revoked* its decrees. Historians have accordingly perceived in Cadore's letter a deep "ambiguity" so well framed to deceive that it completely "took in" the trusting president. But clearly no one, not even Madison, "mistook" it as an unconditional offer of revocation. Federalists well complained that Madison wilfully misread and was "willingly the dupe" of Napoleon.⁶¹ Joseph Gales, Sr., confidant of the administration as editor of its organ, the *National Intelligencer*, was informed by Monroe upon its arrival, on September 25, of the Cadore letter "declaring the Berlin and Milan Decrees to be *hypothetically* revoked". In another interview, on the 27th, after "beating around the bush" Monroe

professed not fully to have considered the subject; but inclined to the opinion that the President must take the declaration for the fact, in this case. The arguments he used in favor of the expediency of the measure were that France might be in earnest; it would bring England to the point, and would, besides, have a favorable influence on our elections.

Napoleon seems straightforward. See Napoleon to his minister of the interior, June 25, in *ibid.*, XX. 501; his address to the council of commerce, August 5, in H. Adams (ed.), *The Writings of Albert Gallatin* (Philadelphia, 1879), II. 199. In Napoleon's statements there is no ambiguous present tense, but all is future and conditional. It seems not unlikely that Napoleon was neither cognizant of, nor responsible for, its use by Cadore, who may have used the present tense ingenuously to render the emperor's purely figurative expression: "and he may consider them as revoked. . . ." The theory of deep-laid, overwhelming ambiguity seems a rather labored interpretation by writers seeking a simple and most favorable explanation of Madison's proclamation of November 2. Or was Napoleon's July instructions merely a clever saving device by which he could disavow a deliberately ambiguous letter through Cadore if after-events should prove it too bitter a dose to the Americans?

⁶¹ When congress met one federalist wrote: "He has issued his proclamation in favor of France in direct contradiction to his own construction of the power given him by the last nonintercourse law". Joseph Pearson to John Steele, December 23, 1810, in H. M. Wagstaff (ed.), *The Papers of John Steele* (Raleigh, N. C., 1924), II. 645. Cf. S. E. Morrison, *The Life and Letters of Harrison Gray Otis* (Boston and New York, 1913), II. 23, 37. "This connected with the Florida proclamation", added Pearson, "may probably lead to war with both England and Spain".

On October 4, Secretary Gallatin similarly told Gales that "he thought the President must issue his Proclamation". Gales, desiring to know more of the official view, visited President Madison on October 17 and incidentally

mentioned the state of West Florida, (Mr. Barlow having this morning told me that Colonel Cushing and four Companies had been marched to Fort Stoddard to repress any risings of the people, within the United States). He [Madison] observed that he imagined measures had been adopted which would prevent our being involved by the ardor of our citizens. *As to the independence of the Floridas, if Bonaparte was sincere in the declarations he was said to have made, he would not object to it: if he was opposed to their independence, policy should induce him to let them alone,* for his interference would immediately throw them into the arms of Britain. He thought the British party, together with the refugees from justice, deserters from the United States Army, and land-jobbers, would constitute a majority who would be unwilling that West Florida should come under the jurisdiction of the United States. I stated that I had understood differently, from good authority, Mr. Poindexter, etc.⁶²

Thus some members of the administration had favored a proclamation against England before the actual news of the *anticipated* revolution in West Florida⁶³ arrived; but not until after this occurrence was any step taken. It may be ten-

⁶² Gales' Diary, September 25, 27, October 4, 17, in Gales, "Recollections of the Civil History of the War of 1812", in H. B. Dawson (ed.), *The History Magazine* (Morrisania, N. Y.), Series 3, III. 156, 157. Gales notes on October 25: "News arrived, today, that West Florida is declared independent, by Convention; official information received same day. The Cabinet was in close session, for at least three hours, thereupon, I fancy". *Ibid.*, p. 158. Gales says that Secretary of State Smith was put out of the cabinet (and superseded by Monroe) mainly because of his aggressive hostility toward France, which was expressed in several vigorous dispatches to France which the President—"supinely", according to Smith—would not permit to be sent as originally written. Smith retired publishing insinuations that "French influence" dominated the cabinet. *Ibid.*, pp. 251-255. My italics in text above.

⁶³ Cox, "The American Intervention in East Florida", in *American Historical Review*, XVII. 290-311; Cox, *The West Florida Controversy*, chs. XII., XIII. Madison had actually been encouraging revolt, with a view to intervention, by secret propaganda. He told Secretary of State Robert Smith on July 17, 1810: "I think Govr. Holmes [of Mississippi Territory] should be encouraged in keeping a wakeful eye to occurrences & appearances in W. Florida, and in transmit-

tatively suggested that the desire and decision to take West Florida was one factor in forming the resolution to comply with Napoleon's overture, though one motive was simply to take the step, by proclamation, against England which would *purchase* the French revocation—to have authority for which, under the Macon bill, it was necessary to “believe” that France had actually revoked the decrees.

As self-appointed overseer and “protector” of Spain, Bonaparte, as early as 1808, had offered to let the United States occupy the Floridas *if* it would join him in the war with England. Disliking war as much as he yearned for Florida, Secretary Madison had cheerfully overlooked the objectionable feature, expressing in reply great pleasure at receiving the emperor's approbation of a Florida occupation. Upon this, Cadore informed Armstrong that the allusion to such occupation was incomprehensible! The Americans, at peace with Spain, could not occupy the Florida save with the king's permission, and it had never been a question of allowing an American occupation: “the Emperor had neither the right nor the inclination to authorize an infraction of international law, contrary to the interests of an independent power, his ally and his friend”!⁶⁴ The chicanery and effrontery seems nearly equal on both sides. After this, France continued to hold out inducements.

Soon after Cadore's proposition things came to a head in West Florida, and Madison issued the annexation proclamation on October 27. Would Napoleon not be provoked ting information concerning them. It will be well for him also to be attentive to the means of having his militia in a state for any service that may be called for. In the event either of foreign interference with W. F. or of internal convulsions, more especially if threatening the neighboring tranquility, it will be proper to take care of the rights & interests of the U. S. by every measure within the limits of the Ex. authority. *Will it not be advisable to apprise Govr. H. confidentially, of the course adopted as to W. F. and to have his co-operation in diffusing the impression we wish to be made there?*” Hunt (ed.), *Writings of Madison*, VIII. 105, 106 (my italics).

⁶⁴ Napoleon to Cadore, February 2, June 21, 1808, in *Correspondence de Napoleon*, XVI. 355; XVII. 326; *Am. State Pap., For. Rel.*, III. 250; A. S. de la Faverie, *Napoleon et l'Amérique* (Paris, 1917), p. 209.

greatly, along with Spain, by this bold, arbitrary measure? May not, in short, the non-intercourse proclamation of November 2 have been in part motivated by desire to appease Napoleon, to buy his connivance not only at the present seizure but at the already prospective occupation of East Florida? That Madison entertained this apprehensive consideration appears in his letter of October 29 to Armstrong, just after the West Florida "grab", *in which he announced to France his forthcoming proclamation against England*:

You will see also the step that has been produced by the posture of things in W. Florida. If France is wise she will neither dislike it herself, nor promote resentment of it in any other quarter. She ought in fact, if guided by prudence & good information, to patronize at once, a general separation of S. America from Old Spain. This event is already decided, and the sole question with F. is whether it is to take place under her auspices, or those of G. B.⁶⁵

If the later proclamation was intended partly to make the earlier palatable to Napoleon it succeeded admirably. Bonaparte instructed Cadore on December 13 to write a dispatch to his minister at Washington in reply:

You will express in that letter the satisfaction I have felt on reading the late letters from America. You will give assurance that, if the American government has decided to maintain the independence of its flag, it will find every kind of aid and privileges in this country. Your letter will be . . . in cypher. You will make it known therein that I shall do nothing to hinder the Floridas from becoming an American possession; that I desire, in general, all that can aid the independence of Spanish America . . . provided that it shall not be under the influence of England.⁶⁶

Is it likely that Napoleon's reaction to the Florida occupation would have been so cordial if Madison had not been so conveniently compliant?

RICHARD R. STENBERG.

University of Arkansas.

⁶⁵ Hunt (ed.), *Writings of Madison*, VIII. 114-117.

⁶⁶ *Correspondence de Napoleon*, XXI. 371, 372.

DOCUMENT

COMMISSION OF FRANCISCO DE IBARRA FOR THE CONQUEST OF NUEVA VIZCAYA

In his volume on Francisco de Ibarra, Professor Mecham¹ states (p. 75):

On September 30, 1558, Velasco reported to the king that the project had to be postponed because of the great urgency of dispatching an expedition of thirteen vessels and about fifteen hundred soldiers under command of Tristán de Luna to Santa Elena in Florida. In the meantime, he stated, he had sent three friars to San Martín to assist Fray Mendoza in his missionary work. They were also instructed to investigate conditions and to prepare the field, it being his intention to supplement their work by an expedition, equipped at small expense to the king, to search for the elusive Copalá. Although Francisco de Ibarra was not mentioned in the communication, it appears that he was empowered to accompany the friars and to explore in the northern frontier, for Velasco, in issuing Ibarra his commission as governor of Nueva Vizcaya (July 24, 1562), said, "I granted a commission to Francisco de Ibarra in order that with certain religious men of the Order of St. Francis, and Spaniards who go in his company, they might enter the land beyond San Martín and Aviño and discover the settlements that are said to be in those parts". It is remarkable that Ibarra in his *información* and in his letters did not see fit to mention the viceregal permission to accompany the friars, but there can be little doubt that such consent had been given.

Mecham goes on to describe the activities of the friars at San Martín and adds (p. 78):

According to his [Ibarra's] *información*, "Ibarra, knowing the great danger the religious and their soldiers would run in that land,

¹ J. Lloyd Mecham, *Francisco de Ibarra and Nueva Vizcaya* (Durham, N. C., 1927).

it being undiscovered and the Indians at war, joined them with a certain number of soldiers equipped at his own expense". This would seem to indicate that the viceregal permit enabling Ibarra to accompany the friars came subsequent to the appearance of the friars in San Martín.

While working in the archives at Mexico City in 1932 I happened upon the original commission issued by Luis de Velasco to Francisco de Ibarra for the conquest of Nueva Vizcaya, which is reproduced below. Not only does it confirm all of Mecham's surmises, but it states clearly the new policy of the Spanish crown in regard to undertaking new conquests. Just twenty years had passed since the disastrous Coronado expedition, in which the crown and all concerned had lost heavily. At that time the crown had forbidden any new expeditions. Ibarra, as will be seen, is given nothing but his *vara de justicia*, with no promise of reward of any kind. The document is also of interest as regards the claims of Oidor Morones to the province of Chiametla (for which see Mecham, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-98).

The document is reproduced as it is, save that I have capitalized the proper names, extended the abbreviations, and introduced a minimum of punctuation.

LESLEY BYRD SIMPSON.

TITULO DE CAPITAN A FRANCISCO DE YBARRA²

Yo, etc., por quanto su magestad por prouision rreal a mi dirigida, dada en Valladolid a diez y nueue dias del mes de diziembre del año de mill e quinientos y cinquenta y siete, me da licencia e facultad para que si biere conbenir a su rreal seruicio pueda ynbiar e ynbie las personas que me pareciere ha hazer nuevos descubrimientos de las prouincias sujetas a la audiencia rreal de la Nueva España, no enbargante la prouision que sobre el caso estaua hecha, segun que mas largamente en la dicha prouision se contiene, el tenor del qual es este que se sigue:

² Archivo General de la Nación. Mexico. Ramo de Mercedes, tomo V, hojas 248-249.

Don Felipe, por la gracia de Dios rrey de Castilla, de Leon, de Aragon, de Ynglaterra, de Francia, de las dos Cecilias, de Jherusalén, de Nauarra, de Granada, de Toledo, de Valencia, de Galizia, de Mallorca, de Seuilla, de Cerdeña, de Cordoua, de Corcega, de Murcia, de Jaem, de los Algarues, de Algecira, de Gibraltar, de las Yslas de Canaria, de las Yndias, Yslas e Tierra Firme del Mar Oceano, Conde de Barcelona, Señor de Vizcaya e de Molina, Duque de Atenas y de Neopatria, Conde de Ruisellon e de Cerdeña, Marques de Oristan e de Gociano, Archiduque de Austria, Duque de Borgoña y de Brauante e Milan, Conde de Flandes y de Tirol, etc., a vos, don Luis de Velasco, nuestro visorrey y capitán general de la Nueva España y presidente de la audiencia rreal que en ella rresiden, porque, segun lo que por nos esta proueydo e mandado, vos no podeis enbiar a hazer nuevos descubrimientos y poblaciones ni proueer gouernadores para hellas sin nuestra licencia y especial mandado, y nos deseando mucho que esa tierra y prouincias della sujetas a esa audiencia, y la Florida, se pueblen e pongan en toda pulicia, asi para que los naturales dellas questan sin lumbre de fee sean alumbrados y enseñados en ella, como para que ellos y los españoles que en esas tierras rresiden y a ellas pasaren sean aprouechados y se arraigen y tengan asiento y manera de biuir, a parecido dar horden como las dichas poblaciones se hagan, y por la mucha confiança que de vuestra persona tenemos, abemos acordado de os rremittir esto para que vos como persona que teneis la cosa presente y bereis lo que conberna hazerse para el seruicio de Dios nuestro señor, y nuestro, como para el bien de la tierra, proueays en ello lo que os pareciere, por ende, por la presente vos damos licencia y facultad para que si vos vierdes conbenir podais enbiar y enbieys a hazer los dichos nuevos descubrimientos e poblaciones conforme a la ystrucion que cerca dellos os mandamos ynbiar, la qual guardareis e hareis que se guarde en todo y por todo como en ella se contiene, y las personas que ynbiaredes a las dichas poblaciones y nuevos descubrimientos dar les eys vos con los oydores desa audiencia el despacho nescesario conforme a la dicha ystrucion para que se escusen los daños y deshordenes que asta aqui a abido en nuevos descubrimientos, y sienpre terneis cuydado de saber como se cunplen las prouisiones e ynstruciones que se les dieron y como son tratados los naturales de la tierra adonde fueren. Dada en Valladolid a veynte y nueue de diziembre de mill e quinientos e cinquenta e siete años.

La Princesa, por Francisco de Ledesma, secretario de su catolica magestad, la fize escreuir por su mandado. Su Alteza. En su nonbre, el licenciado Bribiesca, el licenciado don Juan Sarmiento, el dotor Basquez, el licenciado Billagomez. Registrada, Ochoa de Luynos. Por chanciller, Juan de Anguciana.

Y porque agora soy ynformado y tengo noticia que adelante de las minas de San Martín, ques en el nueuo rreyno de Galizia, ay algunas tierras y prouincias questan por descubrir y sin saber el secreto dellas y se tiene entendido ser muy poblada de naturales, y al seruicio de Dios nuestro señor y al de su magestad conbiene que se descubra la dicha tierra la via del norte para que los naturales della questan sin lumbre de fee sean alumbrados y enseñados en ella y biuan en pulicia y se pueblen pueblos despañoles donde puedan ser aprouechados y se arraiguen e hagan algunas poblaciones en los pueblos que descubrieren y binieren de paz y no ayan dado la obediencia a su magestad; y para que se consiga el dicho hefeto y cunplimiento de la corona rreal d'España es nescesario enbiar vna persona de confiança que baya en descubrimiento y demanda de la dicha tierra, por ende, confiando de vos, Francisco de Ybarra, que sois tal persona que bien y fielmente hareis lo que os fuere cometido y encargado y manda el seruicio de Dios nuestro señor y el de su magestad, bien y conseruacion de los naturales de los pueblos y prouincias que descubrieredes, por la presente os doy licencia e facultad para que podais yr e bais a descubrir y descubrays las poblaciones y tierra que ay adelante de las minas de San Martin hasta ochenta o cien leguas la bia del norte, sin llegar ni entrar en la prouincia de Chiometla, por quanto su magestad tiene cometido la poblacion de la dicha prouincial al dotor Morones, oydor de la audiencia rreal del dicho rreyno, y llevar con bos a asta quarenta o cinquenta personas españoles en vuestra compañía al dicho descubrimiento; y, si ser pudiere, llevar algunos rreligiosos o çacerdotes para la ynstrucion y conbercion de los naturales de los pueblos que asi descubrieredes y binieren de paz, os encargo que procureis de los llevar y [en ?] el dicho descubrimiento de la dicha tierra; y procureis que sea con toda paz y amistad con los naturales y haziendoles buenas obras para que de su voluntad bengan en conocimiento de nuestra santa fee catolica y den la obediencia a su magestad como a su rrey y señor natural, y dandoles a entender que se desea su saluacion y que biuan en pulicia como christianos y que en todo an de ser faborecidos

y ayudados, e que por ningunas personas les sean hechas ningunas fuerças, agrauios, ni otros malos tratamientos, y que an de ser anparados sus personas y haziendas que tubieren; y, hechas estas diligencias y amonestaciones mediante ynterpretes que los entiendan tres bezes por distancia de tienpo, si por caso los dichos naturales no quisieren permitir el dicho descubrimiento, defendiendooos dellos, sin hazer mas daño de aquel que fuere menester para vuestra defensa, podreis proseguir el dicho descubrimiento, el qual asi hecho e vos pareciere y bieredes que conbenga quedar en la tierra entre tanto que me enbiais la rrelacion muy particular de todo lo que asi descubriredes y de la calidad de la tierra y naturales della [y] de los aprouechamientos que obiere, para que visto todo se prouea lo que conbenga al seruicio de su magestad y a la poblacion de la tierra, lo hareis y en nonbre de su magestad tomareis y aprehendereis la posesion de los tales pueblos y tierras que descubriredes, y enbiareis ante mi los autos que sobre ello se hizieren y pasaren; y mando a las personas que con vos fueren al dicho descubrimiento que os tengan por caudillo en nonbre de su magestad y os obedezcan y cunplan lo que vos en su rreal nonbre probeyerdes y mandardes, so las penas que les pusierdes; que para executar en las personas y bienes de los que rrebeldes e ynobedientes fueren, y para conocer de los casos y negocios que se ofrecieren, asi cebiles como criminales, e llevar y tener bara de justicia hasta que otra cosa se prouea, os doy poder y facultad, segun que en tal caso se rrequiere. Fecho en Mexico, a dos dias del mes de hebrero de mill e quinientos e sesenta e vn años. Don Luis de Velasco. Por mandado de su señoria ylustriissima, Geronimo Lopez.

[ABSTRACT]

On December 19, 1557, the king gave the viceroy permission to undertake new discoveries in New Spain and Florida, notwithstanding the royal order to the contrary. In these new discoveries, the viceroy is to take proper measures to prevent mistreatment of the natives and take other precautions.

The viceroy has received information to the effect that eighty to a hundred leagues to the north of the mines of San Martín in New Galicia there are well populated and unexplored provinces. To spread the gospel among the inhabitants, bring them to an orderly way of life, and to establish communities of Spaniards there, it will be necessary to send a person of trust among them. He therefore (Mexico, February 2, 1561) gives Francisco de Ibarra, as such a person, permission to go thither and explore those territories. Ibarra is not, however, to touch the province of Chiametla, which has been assigned for exploration to Dr.

Morones, oidor of the audiencia of New Galicia. He may bring forty to fifty Spaniards in his company and, if possible, several religious or secular priests for the instruction of the natives. He is to maintain peace with the natives, inducing them to accept Christianity and to recognize the king as their natural lord and sovereign, explaining to them the benefits they will receive as Christians and vassals of his majesty, and he is to allow no one to mistreat them. If they resist him they are to be warned three times at proper intervals, after which he may proceed, defending himself from them and harming them as little as possible. If Ibarra thinks the country is worth holding he may remain there, but he is to send a detailed account of the country to the viceroy. He will also, in such a case, take possession of the country in the name of his Majesty and send the proper documents of his action to the viceroy. The men of the company are ordered to obey Ibarra as their commander and he is given authority to enforce his commands and jurisdiction over civil and criminal cases.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Spanish Crown, 1808-1931: An Intimate Chronicle of a Hundred Years. By ROBERT SENCOURT. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932. Pp. ix, 399, Illustrated. \$5.00.)

Since the fall of the Spanish monarchy in April, 1931, a number of books have appeared, particularly in England, dealing with the life of Alfonso XIII. and his family. The present well illustrated work recording the intimate history of the Spanish Bourbons from 1808 to the recent departure of the last reigning head of the house may readily be ranked as one of the best and most important of these publications. In a highly interesting fashion the author causes the various kings and queens, who have occupied the Spanish throne during the past century and a quarter, to pass before the reader. The character of each is portrayed with keen insight and sympathy together with commendable fidelity to historical accuracy.

Beginning with the machinations of the unscrupulous Ferdinand VII. against his father, the amiable but inept Charles IV., and his strong-minded mother, María Luisa, who, with her favorite, Godoy, actually controlled Spain's destinies for a period, the author tells the story of the captivity by Napoleon and the later restoration of Ferdinand to his unfortunate subjects after the short reign of Joseph Bonaparte, the many marriages of this Bourbon and his reactionary rule. Especially well drawn are the portraits of the impetuous niece and widow of Ferdinand VII., María Cristina, and her impulsive, over-sexed daughter, Isabel II., whose love for Spain was nearly as great as her incapacity for ruling it and who was finally compelled to abandon her throne in 1868. For the author the Restoration of the Bourbons after the seven hectic years of the short-lived reign of Amadeo I. and the First Republic was a return to normalcy, as indeed it was. The reestablishment of relative tranquillity under Alfonso XII. is extolled, and ample justice is done to the admirable character of his widow, María Cristina de Habsburg, who became queen regent during the minority of her precocious, likeable son, Alfonso XIII. The career of the latter is studied carefully from his

birth to his hasty departure for France after the municipal elections of April, 1931, and the author offers some shrewd observations regarding the character and rule of this last Bourbon.

Throughout the whole of the narrative an objective though understanding attitude toward the various members of the Bourbon dynasty is maintained; their virtues are revealed but no attempt is made to conceal their frequently more glaring defects. In the Conclusion which the author appends to his work he steps down from his pedestal of a disinterested observer, lays aside the manner of the judicial historian, and becomes an open partizan of the royal principle and particularly of the royal family now living in exile. In the superficial discussion of the new-born republic, opinion is substituted for facts or the latter are distorted to fit the author's prejudices; he sees no health in the new order and thinks that the Spaniards already know that they are paying dear for "acquiescing" in the exile of their beloved king and queen. His ardent advocacy of the royalist cause moves him to make many imprudent assertions such as "that French absolutism [that of the Spanish Bourbons] had done no harm". Such sweeping statements are unworthy of a serious historian and are disproved, in part at least, by the first part of the author's work. Doubtless, he would hotly exclaim if the more valid declaration were made that "that French absolutism had done no good".

The Bourbons received the throne at the beginning of the eighteenth century when the decline of the Spanish nation was practically complete. It is difficult to see, after nearly two centuries and a third of Bourbon rule, that they have left the country any better than they found it. National unity is the one great blessing alleged for which the crown is supposed to be responsible, but any intelligent observer of contemporary Spain knows how hollow is this claim. After reading the author's exceedingly able account of the Bourbon family from 1808 to 1931, one is struck by the fact that, consciously or unconsciously, he has set forth in bold relief the singular and almost incredible ineptness of every member of the dynasty that has occupied the throne in that period, not excluding the last representative. The author himself puts his finger on the fundamental weakness in the character of Alfonso XIII. and the one which, perhaps, was most fatal to his success as a king, when he points out that Alfonso was never able to understand the intellectuals and was blind to the tre-

mendous influence that they were exerting. It was a sorry blunder to banish the famous philosopher and scholar, Don Miguel de Unamuno, from Spain, and it might have been better if Alfonso had tried to coax back the noisy Blasco Ibañez from his self-imposed exile. Regarding this indifference to the thinkers and writers, the author states (p. 346):

Every type of thoughtfulness was alien to Don Alfonso [XIII.], and even when he visited a school or university, the Duke of Miranda, his major-domo, arranged that he should speak with no one but those in a brilliant social position, or else the successful sportsmen. The scholars did not count. While the leading spirits were awakening to a great creative effort, he hung away from it, and gave his whole confidence to the great agencies of Conservative authority, the Army and the Church. The reaction was inevitable.

Here the author has expressed eloquently the singular ineptness which made the attractive personality of Alfonso XIII. unsuited to the needs of a twentieth century world, even a twentieth century Spain. After reading this well-phrased statement it is difficult to understand the author's almost lachrymose recital of the ex-king's departure. Any intelligent student of recent Spanish history is cognizant of the tremendous influence the intellectuals have exerted on the events of the past few years, and the king's inability or unwillingness to perceive this made the loss of his throne inevitable.

The author has also demonstrated, though probably not deliberately, that the chief purpose of the Bourbons has invariably been to make themselves secure on their throne. To accomplish this the welfare of the Spanish people has nearly always been subordinated to the security of the Bourbon family. The occasional embracing of liberal or forward-looking principles by members of the dynasty can be traced to this *idée fixe*. From time immemorial the pillars of the Spanish monarchy have been the aristocracy, the church, and the army. Alfonso, blind to the fact that such a situation was an anachronism in the twentieth century, favored the small group of great landholders constituting the aristocracy, actively supported from the national income an overgrown medieval church, much of whose religious zeal had degenerated to an empty formalism, and maintained a ludicrously overstaffed army, which was probably the most inefficient force in Europe and incapable of defending Spain from an armed invasion. Even in the closing days of his reign, when he felt his scepter slipping, Alfonso was feverishly promoting officers to higher ranks in

commands that really did not exist in order to hold their fast fading loyalty to his cause. These institutions, absorbing a large part of the national income, existed in large measure to safeguard the monarchy, and it is difficult to see how such abuses could be considered some of the benefits of "French absolutism" which the author asserts did no harm in Spain. Incidentally, should the cruel Carlist wars with their senseless carnage in the nineteenth century be reckoned among the blessings that the monarchy has bestowed upon the troubled peninsula?

The author speaks glowingly of the material progress made in Spain after the Restoration in 1875 ("for nearly fifty years Spain walked forward in the presence of the constitutional sovereign"). Much of this growth and development was inevitable even in Spain which could not live forever entirely divorced from the industrial revolution. And, speaking of statesmanship, the author does not suggest that the only outstanding figures of this class with valid claims to greatness in the nineteenth century were Castelar and Pi y Margal, the idealistic if impractical leaders of the short-lived First Republic. The chicanery and moral turpitude of the ministers and parliamentary leaders, both before and after this troubled interlude, make these supporters of the monarchy unworthy of comparison with the lofty spirits of the statesmen named above. It was they who advocated the freeing of slaves in Puerto Rico and a more modern and humane treatment of the Cubans. But the Restoration merely returned to the old methods of exploitation and brought on the disastrous Spanish-American War, thus removing the last vestiges of the greatest empire the world has known. Incidentally, it was this war which gave rise to the so-called "Generation of '98" in Spain, that group of young intellectuals seeking the regeneration of the peninsula, whom Alfonso XIII. made the fatal mistake of ignoring and who have finally unseated him from his throne.

An otherwise excellent work has been seriously marred by the appending of a conclusion which is decidedly out of harmony with the fine attitude of detachment displayed in the preceding chapters. In closing, the reviewer ventures to make the suggestion that the author remove his conclusion entirely or greatly modify it in a future edition of this work (which is entitled to more than one), thus leaving to posterity, with its greater perspective and detachment from the passions of the day, the task of making the final judgment on such con-

troversial matters as the importance of the Bourbon family in Spain and the indispensability of the monarchy as an institution in the peninsula.

IRVING A. LEONARD.

University of California,
Berkeley.

United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, 1848-1868. Edited with an Introduction by LEO FRANCIS STOCK. (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1933. Pp. xxxix, 456. \$5.00.)

"This Government has not now, it seldom has had, any special transaction, either commercial or political, to engage the attention of a minister at Rome," wrote Secretary Seward in his letter of instruction to Richard M. Blatchford. Why then did the United States maintain a legation at the Papal See? It was because the American Government finally appreciated (1848), in view of the large Catholic immigration to this country, and papal recognition and support of the principle of political freedom on the part of the Catholics in this country, that "it was neither wise nor necessary to exclude Rome from the circle of our diplomatic intercourse". Furthermore, there was recognition of Rome's strategic importance as a news center of Europe. This latter fact gives the correspondence of the present volume an enhanced value.

The difficulties of American diplomatic representation to a foreign state essentially theocratic can be readily appreciated. All of the American ministers were duly cautioned consequently, that they were political representatives only, and to regard spiritual and ecclesiastical matters as beyond their province. To the credit of our representatives it may be stated that there was never the least violation of this principle (that is, if we except Minister King's "informal" support before the Pope, of a certain Father Dunne as Bishop of Dubuque, Iowa). Perhaps this happy separation of the political from the ecclesiastical was helped by the fact that all of our ministers were Protestants.

The life of the American legation in Rome coincided almost exactly with the pontificate of Pius IX. This correspondence adds much to our knowledge of one of the most remarkable papal reigns in history,

and helps to correct certain false impressions concerning the conservatism of that truly great pontiff. The despatches of the American ministers are particularly valuable for the history of Italian unification touching on the Roman question.

For American history the value of the correspondence is to be found in those statements of Papal and European opinion and attitude toward our civil war. That the Pope inclined to the Confederacy is emphatically contradicted. To the contrary, Pius IX., "as a supporter of constituted authority and just laws", was a sympathizer of the Union cause. As for his great secretary of state, Cardinal Antonelli, he told Minister Blatchford that if he had the honor of being an American citizen he would do everything in his power to preserve the strength of the nation undivided.

To students of Hispanic-American history, this correspondence is disappointing, in that allusions to the major incident in Hispanic America during the period, *i.e.*, the French intervention in Mexico, are meager. Minister King joined the diplomatic corps in attending a reception to "the Emperor and Empress of Mexico". For this mistake he was reproved by Secretary Seward. Cardinal Antonelli told King that "he had cautioned the Austrian Prince against undertaking the enterprise". Secretary of Legation Hooker wrote Seward (September 1, 1865), "The Roman Government would be glad to see us quarrel with Maximilian, because we have always respected the rights of its Church. Had Maximilian played into the hands of the Church—all would have been well". When Charlotte was in Rome on her tragic mission to the Pope, she is reported to have spoken "most enthusiastically of Mexico—says Europe was tame after that country". In no small measure, Maximilian's fall was due to his liberal religious policy which alienated the Mexican clergy and the Pope.

This volume of correspondence, edited by Dr. Stock with meticulous care, inaugurates a series of documentary publications of the American Catholic Historical Association. The collection of documents illustrative of our relations with the Papal States was deemed first in importance because it bridges a gap which existed in the diplomatic history of the United States, and because it records a chapter of American Catholic history.

J. LLOYD MECHAM.

The University of Texas.

Pedro de Alvarado, Conquistador. By EAGHAN KELLY. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1932. Pp. 279. Illus. \$3.50.)

The career of Pedro de Alvarado falls into two parts: (1) as a lieutenant of Cortés in the conquest of Mexico to 1523, and (2) as a conquistador in his own right, 1524-1541. In recognition of this natural division the author arranges his material, giving to each part almost exactly equal space. A balanced treatment undoubtedly dictates such an arrangement, yet, since Part One is neither more nor less the oft told story of Hernán Cortés and the conquest of Mexico, it is Part Two which gives to this book its principal interest and value. The later career of Pedro de Alvarado is certainly much less known and should present greater opportunities for contribution.

Mr. Kelly adds nothing to our knowledge concerning the Cortesian Conquest, or the rôle played in that stirring drama by Pedro de Alvarado. He bases his account on such well-known references as Bernal Díaz del Castillo, Prescott, and Bancroft. But the treatment of this phase of the Conquistador's career is not without merit and value. The summarization of the story of the conquest, within the brief limits of 118 pages, is about as readable as the reviewer has ever encountered. The reviewer also notes with sympathy Mr. Kelly's reaction against the anti-Spanish bias of later-day historians of the conquest. "Constant repetition", he says, "has given semblance of fact to the alleged extreme cruelty of the Spanish conquerors toward the Indian inhabitants of America".

For his all-too-brief discussion of Alvarado's pacification of Guatemala, the author makes use of, in addition to the standard chroniclers, scattered materials in manuscript form, and particularly two letters written by Alvarado to Cortés (translated by Mr. S. J. Mackie, and published in 1925 by the Cortes Society). It appears that if the Maya-Quiche culture was as highly developed as the author claims, a more detailed description would have been justified. The organization and administration of the captaincy-general, the expedition to Ecuador, and even the final episode, the fatal intervention in the Mixtón War, all bear evidence of summary treatment. Failure of the author to consult pertinent materials, such as are to be found in Pacheco y Cardenas's *Documentos Inéditos*, prevent this work from even remotely resembling a definitive study. Yet withal, it is a read-

able, and reasonably accurate, short account of the career of the great Conquistador.

J. LLOYD MECHAM.

The University of Texas.

The French in Sonora (1850-1854), The Story of French Adventurers from California into Mexico. By RUFUS KAY WYLLYS. [University of California Publications in History, Volume 21.] (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932. Pp. xii, 319. \$3.50.)

From the time of La Salle to Louis Napoleon, France has periodically shown its designs on Mexico, one of the episodes being the filibustering expeditions from California to Sonora. The setting seemed perfect. After the treaty of 1848, neither the United States nor Mexico offered security on the new border. Sonora suffered from geographic isolation, Indian raids, migration to California, desertion from border posts, and inadequate defense—conditions inviting intervention. Disgruntled and restless French adventurers in California were willing to follow those who promised that wealth and happiness were to be found in Sonora, and Mexico favored French colonization as a means of holding back both Indian and Anglo-American.

Undisturbed by sporadic attempts and failures of French and Americans to colonize or acquire Sonora, Count Raousset-Boulbon, the reckless and restless "wolf-cub", the master adventurer, would make himself the "sultan of Sonora". He turned his executive ability to the organization of a French mining and colonizing company as a subsidiary of a Franco-Mexican banking house. Count Raousset's three attempts to gain control of Sonora ended in failure because Mexican officials hampered his activities, rival companies sought control, and the public failed to respond. Even the anticipated distraction of the Plan of Ayutla against Santa Anna failed to bring success. The execution of the count at the age of thirty-six terminated French filibustering activities from California.

The author is doubtful about any close connection between Louis Napoleon and the filibusters, although French officials in the foreign service gave occasional support. A few political leaders in the United States suspected the French government of complicity and considered the Maximilian episode as a culmination of the Sonora incident.

Dr. Wyllys has summarized the main points in his study as follows:

first, Mexico's need of adequate frontier population and defense; second, the availability of Latin Europeans in California for the military colonial scheme; third, the economic motives which drew most of the California French to Sonora; fourth, the perversion of a harmless French penetration of Sonora into a rebellion led by a daring French adventurer; fifth, the persistent efforts of this same adventurer to push his plans still farther by taking advantage of a change of government in Mexico and of the mistakes of the new regime; and sixth, the series of fortuitous circumstances which made it possible for him to have a last desperate fling at the game of empire—and his failure.

The work is excellently documented. The footnotes also contain corrections of the more fantastic and legendary accounts of the adventurers. The work contains several illustrations, two maps, a bibliography, an index, and sixty-one pages of original French and Spanish documents. Dr. Wyllys has contributed a good account of an interesting episode in international affairs and border history.

JOHN RYDJORD.

The Municipal University of Wichita.

Porfirio Diaz. By NEMESIO GARCÍA NARANJO. (San Antonio, Texas: Casa Editorial Lozano, 1930. Pp. 314, [4]. Front. Ports.)

Here comes Pancho Villa; the anecdote History of a genial Killer. By LOUIS STEVENS. (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1930. Pp. 4, 309.)

Perhaps it is just as well that we shall never transcend the personal element in our estimates of historical trends. That means, always, the champion will have a word to say, and his dictum must be listened to. In the ever repeated estimates of the historical place of Porfirio Diaz there will be the unbosoming of the disappointments by a Francisco Bulnes, or a paean of praise by a Nemesio García Naranjo. Pilate washes his hands in the waters brought in his ewer; truth, especially about such an enigmatic personage as Don Porfirio, can never be contained under a simple formula, or thesis of an innate beneficence or an ingrown malignancy. García Naranjo, beneficiary of the lost cause, still sees its glories and mourns its loss. His estimate of the great president is of course that of the group which has suffered most in the years of revolutionary Mexico. Whatever may be said of his opinions regarding the essential honesty of Diaz during his closing years of the presidency, it may be admitted that in the

earlier ones before the Plan of Tuxtepec, he was no more selfish than his contemporaries. Failing to catch the vision of a Mexican incarnated by a régime of law, he started on the career of the man on horseback, with a pseudo patriotism as his motive, and rode to the end of the way, each day becoming more and more involved in the accidentals of a governmental system which could not appreciate the oncoming wave of social entity which bore the Mexican people toward a freer, more open, though more hazardous, destiny. In short, if one wants to feel with the old privileged class its losses, and review the merits of its defeated champion, he will, with other haters of Carranza and his régime, take consolation in the pages of García Naranjo's volume. It is perhaps worth noting that this book would not have been printed in Mexico. It stands in sharp contrast to the wider-visioned biography by Carlton Beals, who follows the revolutionary estimates with not enough discrimination. An historical estimate, documented, of Díaz, is still needed.

Turning to Louis Stevens's *Here Comes Pancho Villa*, one may observe that there are various classes of horses and horsemen. It is unfortunate that the characters of Díaz and Villa should come under observation together. The biographer of Díaz had at least a grand subject; it is not so certain that Pancho Villa deserves even the fame which has descended upon him. In his "Anecdotal History of a Genial Killer", Stevens acclaims the border ruffian as something of a great man. What seems evident from perusal of Stevens is that the American newsgatherer, or the sympathizer with the hardy Americans who tried in the old days to win fortune in northern Mexico, has a sort of awed respect for the untutored champion of the border who would not respect an ordered society, but expected by dint of personal prowess to make a world for himself. There is certainly fascination in following the self-delusion of a forceful "bad man" through his incomprehensible campaigns, and even recreation in reading some of the anecdotes. One may do this more at length in the trilogy by Rafael Muñoz on the same topic, or in the sketches by Nellie Campobello (*Cartucho*, in Ediciones Integrales). There was an element of heroics in Villa which made him important to the common peasant or to the industrial invader who never thought out a social or economic understanding of Mexico. But Villa was little more than an outlaw; Wilson's quest for a great man turned his head;

he was a saturnine failure as leader in Mexico City, a sadist who found much opportunity for his predilections, and a scourge who did nothing constructive in all his career. It should be said that the jacket blurb announcing that the author had conducted much research on his subject will not be literally accepted by historians. There is no evidence of genuine research in the book.

HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY.

University of California,
Berkeley.

Thunder in Their Veins. A Memoir of Mexico. By LEONE B. MOATS, edited by RUSSEL LORD. (New York: The Century Company, 1932. Pp. ix, 279.)

Here we have a book of reminiscences and experiences with the advantages and handicaps of all such. The writer is witty, has a readable style, and a keen sense of the unusual and striking. Having lived in Mexico for twenty-four years, she was privileged to span the period from Porfirio Díaz to the present date. Obviously she belongs to that class of United States citizens in Mexico who, while representing considerable wealth, abstained from dabbling in the politics of the country and so did not fall afoul of any of the changing governments.

Mrs. Moats refrains from commenting on the agrarian problem, the petroleum industry, etc., for she is directly concerned with the telling of a story of life in Mexico as she witnessed it, or as she heard of it. Here creeps in one of the weaknesses of the volume. The writer is so anxious to retain interest that throughout the volume, and especially in such chapters as "Bedlam" and "Buzzard Meat", she gathers stories of horrors, immorality, and irregularities from all sides. The result reminds one of a popular mystery story with one good substantial murder to start with and from two to half a dozen thrown in in a casual fashion whenever the interest threatens to wane.

The outstanding feature of the volume is the fact that the author is true to the thinking of many of the best of those representing foreign investments in Mexico. She refers to herself as one of those who "consciously do not believe in democracy" (p. 32), and sees the old days of Porfirio Díaz through such a glamorous haze that she says that Mexico City contained "no filth" then (p. 21). It is strange, however, to note that any one still feels that Díaz ignored the con-

stitution rather than obey a document "that allowed the country . . . to be looted" (p. 50), when the land and mineral laws passed with his encouragement delivered natural resources worth tens of millions of dollars to one small group. True to the same idea, even Victoriano Huerta's political and personal morals receive a liberal coat of white-wash. The reviewer is positively at a loss for words with which to comment on such statements as are found on p. 109: ". . . a 'traitor' Huerta certainly was not. He had refused as military chief to turn against the President until the legislative bodies had deposed Madero and given him the command". "His [Huerta's] dress, manners, and morals offended the excessively fastidious, but he was a grand old character, for all of that". The natural converse of this attitude is a severe criticism of the policies of President Woodrow Wilson (see, for example, pp. 113 and 122), while with equal consistency, F. I. Madero is pictured as petty and thoroughly incompetent.

A somewhat surprising attitude of the volume is the complimentary treatment accorded Emiliano Zapata, the rebel of Morelos. It would seem that all classes are slowly coming to realize the significance of this man and of his movement. Terrorism under Carranza is stressed, together with the irregularities and weaknesses of the old general, till he becomes little better than a hypocritical thief of petty pieces of furniture.

The outstanding accomplishments of Ambassador Morrow would seem to be interpreted through the eyes of a group who failed to receive through him the official support they would have liked. He is treated with the proverbial "faint praise" which may be seen in: "He was infinitely above petty connivance; and that is as it should be. Only, it is a good thing, at times, if you are going to understand a country, to know what is going on" (p. 227).

Obregón and Calles are both approved: "As much as one liked Obregón, the fact remains that of the two, he could better be spared" (p. 261). "Obregón slapped backs. Calles foregoes that gesture; and no one, you may be sure, has ever slapped his. He inspires fear" (p. 262). Other high compliments are paid to Calles's personal life and efficiency.

The typography and make up of the volume are to be complimented. Spanish words and spellings are especially accurate and only some three slips were noted in the whole volume.

In a single sentence: This is the apology of a group or class and as such is of real value to the historian, but it is far from being a dispassionate or balanced view of the country.

W. H. CALCOTT.

Columbia, South Carolina.

The Mercurio Volante of Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora. An Account of the First Expedition of Don Diego de Vargas into New Mexico in 1692. Translated, with Introduction and Notes by IRVING ALBERT LEONARD, Ph.D. University of California. The Quivira Society, Los Angeles, 1932.

The serious study of Southwestern colonial history is still in its infancy. Realizing the richness of available unpublished materials bearing on the origin of the region, a group of scholars in 1929 organized the Quivira Society, the purpose of which was to present from time to time significant documents, chiefly translations from the Spanish language, illustrating the history of the Southwest. The present volume, the third in the Quivira Series, is an excellent translation of the Sigüenza y Góngora *Mercurio Volante*, a printed pamphlet concerning the first expedition of Vargas in the reconquest of New Mexico in 1692. With the exception of the studies of the Pueblo revolt and attempts at reconquest by Professor Hackett, and the defective translation of the present pamphlet by Mr. Prince, and fragments of the Vargas diaries by Mr. Twitchell, nothing has been done on the subject of the reconquest. Dr. Leonard's study in this respect stands as a basic contribution to the study of one of the most striking culture conflicts in the Southwest. The editing of the *Mercurio Volante*, from an original in the John Carter Brown Library, has been done with great care. For his materials to prepare the setting, Professor Leonard searched the archives of Seville and Mexico City and had access to private libraries of distinguished Mexican families. In one of the latter he had the good fortune to encounter another original pamphlet.

Dr. Leonard's *Introduction* to the document is written in a delightfully lucid style. For years he has been publishing monographic studies of this great Mexican mathematician, so that he speaks with authority on a figure not only significant in the cultural history of Hispanic America, but one who, in addition to this contribution to

New Mexico, took an important part in Spanish efforts to locate the La Salle colony in Texas and waged an enlightened intellectual battle with Father Kino. The whole Southwest has felt the imprint of Sigüenza's mind.

The details Professor Leonard has gathered on the history of Mexican pamphlet printing before the advent of the regularly appearing periodicals of the early eighteenth century are intriguing. The effect of his researches here is to establish that the *Mercurio Volante* belonged to the earlier type of publication. But of greater significance to scholars is that his study of these prolifically issued yet fugitive, primitive newspapers, lays bare a wholly unsuspected body of historical data. The Quivira Society is to be congratulated upon the publication of this study. Its efforts to make available the basic materials in western origins, such as the *Mercurio Volante* represents, are contributing effectively to bridge the chasm between Coronado and Pike.

The volume reproduces many excellent views of the principal pueblos that figure in Vargas's account. Of no little interest, too, is a reproduction of the rare Fer map of California and New Mexico, the original of which Mr. H. R. Wagner states in a note might possibly have come from Sigüenza's hand.

ALFRED BARNABY THOMAS.

University of Oklahoma,
Norman.

The Odyssey of Cabeza de Vaca. By MORRIS BISHOP. (New York: The Century Company, 1933. Pp. vii, 306. \$3.00.)

Although the suggestive title of this book is not original with the author (for it was used by Opisso in his article in *Hojos Seluta*, May, 1927) it is appropriately descriptive. The life of the hero of the volume is so interesting that the wonder is that the muse of History has so long neglected him. Alvar Núñez was a conquistador of the first rank, endowed with all the great qualities of persistence, daring, and resourcefulness but with a humanitarian spirit unfamiliar in most members of that indomitable class to which the American reading public is being gradually introduced.

Professor Bishop has produced a living being, who not only won renown as a great Spanish marathon walker but as an administrator

and reformer, and as an idealistic dreamer and evangelist. The author has written from the sources, having used not only the relation of Cabeza de Vaca edited by Buckingham Smith but the notes of Smith from which he hoped some day to write a life of his hero. The author has also examined manuscripts in the archives in Seville and the private archives of Marqués de Campo Real. Considerable use has been made of secondary materials in order to fill in the background.

The book is conveniently and logically divided into two parts, the first dealing with the youth of Núñez Cabeza de Vaca in Spain and his adventures in North America, while the second treats of his adventures in South America and his death in Spain. The narrative is satisfactorily balanced. The author, however, errs in accuracy in naming his hero, for Núñez rather than Cabeza de Vaca is his rightful designation. A few other mistakes are discernible but on the whole the work gives a clear and accurate picture of the mid-sixteenth century colonies of Spain, the expedition of Narváez, and the duplicities of the conquerors. The book is delightfully written, many parts with restrained humor, and is in consequence well worth the time spent in reading it.

A. CURTIS WILGUS.

The George Washington University.

The Sacred Symbols of Mu. PROFESSOR JAMES CHURCHWARD. (New York: Ives Washburn, 1933. Pp. 256. \$3.00.)

Readers of Churchward's *The Lost Continent of Mu* and *The Children of Mu* (see this REVIEW for February, 1932) will find in this book a further display of the results of the author's investigation into the origin, nature, and expansion of the people of Mu. But in this case, he delves into the sacred symbols of the people of this island in order to determine their religious psychosis and to compare it with that of other ancient peoples. As a result, he brings to light a number of pseudo-facts upon which he bases such statements as the following: 1. All religions have a common origin in the sacred and inspired writings of Mu. 2. Evidence of this original religion dates back to about 70,000 B. C. although it existed at least 100,000 years before that date. 3. Osiris who lived 20,000 B. C. and Jesus taught the same religion, some of their teachings being word for word, line for line, and sentence for sentence identical. Both learned from the

sacred and inspired writings of Mu. 4. Writings from Western Thebes dating several hundred years before Solomon was born are word for word identical with the proverbs in the Christian Bible written by Solomon which are pure Osirian. 5. There are 42 questions in the Osirian religion which Moses condensed into the ten commandments. 6. The Lord's prayer is to be found in the sacred and inspired writings of Mu and Jesus condensed the ancient text to suit the language of his day. 7. The last words of Jesus on the cross were in the language of Mu which was unknown in Palestine and they are in consequence erroneously translated in the New Testament. 8. The North American Indians came to America from Mu as shown by their legends and symbols. 9. The same sacred symbols were used by the inhabitants of Mu, the Egyptians, the Myians, the East Indians, the Polynesians, and the North American Indians to express their religious ideas. Many of these are still in use today. And 10. Religion and science are twin sisters; neither can exist without the aid of the other. But science is the "Queen of Myths".

In this way does Mr. Churchward deal easily with historical facts. He has been able to solve the hardest problems in his fifty years of research, but these problems have been self imposed and many of the answers have been found largely by the use of the imagination, for he offers no proofs. There can be no doubt but that the author is a victim of his own enthusiasm and of many preconceived ideas. Like the two preceding volumes published by Mr. Churchward this may be relegated to the library shelves containing books lying on the border line between fact and fiction.

A. CURTIS WILGUS.

The George Washington University.

Tentativas de Intervención Europea en América, 1896-1898. By ORESTES FERRARA, Cuban Ambassador in Washington. (Habana: Editorial Hermes, 1933. Pp. 176.)

In *The American Historical Review* (XXX. 1925, 763), some years ago, Professor Lester Burrell Shippee published an article entitled "Germany and the Spanish-American War". This was the first serious monograph to appear on the subject, although the present writer had already prepared the manuscript of a similar article. Later, in 1928, the writer of this review, after a vain effort to secure

access to the archives of England and other European countries, published in his *Latin America in World Politics* a chapter entitled "The European Powers and the Spanish-American War". In the work now under review, the author fails to cite either the article by Shippee or the volume mentioned above.

This fact is not noted with the view of suggesting any defect in the book of Dr. Ferrara, but merely to point out another instance of the failure of Pan-American scholars to avail themselves of the work of their colleagues in this broad field of research and to emphasize the importance of a bibliographical clearinghouse. Dr. Ferrara has examined the sources used by the two writers mentioned (although he appears to have consulted the abridged English edition of *Die Grosse Politik*); and, in addition, he has had access to materials in the archives of France, Italy, and Spain, and has made more thorough use than did his predecessors of the materials in the state department at Washington. Unfortunately, he failed to secure the pertinent documents from the depositories of England and Russia.

Nevertheless, he has produced a thorough and most interesting work. Besides a brief, though most stimulating, introduction, the book contains nine chapters with titles as follows: "Preparation of the Memorandum of 1896"; "The Ideas and Purposes of the Memorandum"; "The Failure (*Quiebra*) of the Memorandum"; "A Diplomatic Retreat (Repliegue)"; "The Good Offices of the United States"; "Austria Concentrates the Effort at Coalition"; "The Intervention of the Pope"; "The Gesture in Washington"; "The Last Effort".

Aside from important revelations regarding Spanish efforts to form an European coalition designed to prevent the intervention of the United States in Cuba, efforts which began as early as 1896, Dr. Ferrera has thrown considerable new light on the attitude of France and Italy. He was unable, however, to reach a definite conclusion on the rôle of Pauncefoot at Washington from April 7 to April 19, when all hope of preventing the Spanish-American War was abandoned. His tentative conclusion, however—a conclusion which seems quite plausible—is that the British ambassador, and dean of the diplomatic corps in Washington, influenced by Queen Victoria, went farther than the foreign office desired in an effort to prevent the outbreak of hostilities. The historian can only lament the failure of the British

government to give access to the documents which would clear up this interesting point. Until it does, he will be disposed to feel that Pauncefote was the aggressor in a projected action which, if carried out, might have been offensive to the people and the government of the United States. The revelation of the Pauncefote correspondence during this period could hardly do any harm at the present time.

J. FRED RIPPY.

Duke University.

The diplomatic Protection of Americans in Mexico. By FREDERICK SHERWOOD DUNN. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933. Pp. vii, 439. \$5.00.)

This is a thorough treatment of a phase, one of the most important phases, of the relations of the United States and Mexico, a book written by an international lawyer who fully realizes the limitations and defects of the international legal system as it has been developed to the present time. Its most important contribution relates to the period since 1910, for many books and monographs have dealt with the earlier period in considerable detail.

Aside from the introduction and the conclusion, the chapter headings are as follows: "Diplomatic Protection and Territorial Ambitions"; "The Isthmian Route and Further Territorial Ambitions"; "Prelude to the Díaz Era"; "Forced Loans and Special Taxes"; "Revolutionary Damages"; "Legislative Limitations on Diplomatic Protection"; "Denial of Justice and Exhaustion of Local Remedies"; "Police Protection"; "Social Revolution and Nationalism"; "Oil"; "Agrarian Reform"; "Nationalism and the Renunciation of Protection"; "The Claims Commissions of 1923".

Most of these topics are in general familiar to the student of United States and Mexican relations through the works of Callahan, Rippy, Rives, Reeves, and others; but the reader will find here a different organization and viewpoint, and a precision hardly to be matched by the historian untrained in international law. The format and printing are excellent; the index unusually complete.

J. FRED RIPPY.

Duke University.

El Adelantado Hernando de Soto. By ANTONIO DEL SOLAR Y TABOADA and JOSÉ DE RÚJULA Y DE OCHOTORENA, Marqués de Ciadoncha. (Badajoz: Ediciones Arqueros, 1929. Pp. 334. Illus. 6 pesetas.)

This is Volume II. in the series "Extremadura en América". It consists of "breves noticias [de Hernando de Soto], nuevos documentos para su biografía y relación de los que le acompañaron a la Florida". The brief notes are taken in great part from the thirteen appendices which form the second part of the volume. The notes are important, but the appendices themselves are real sources that have (with several exceptions) never been published before. These consist of the following: Concierptos de Hernando de Soto con Hernán Ponce de León: La Capitulación con el Soberano para la Conquista de la Florida; Nombramiento de Capitán General de la Florida, de Hernando de Soto; Escritura de dote y arras de Doña Isabel de Bobadilla; Poder otorgado por el Adelantado Hernando de Soto, a su Esposa Doña Isabel de Bobadilla; Requerimiento hecho a Hernán Ponce de León por Doña Isabel de Bobadilla; Información sobre los Méritos y Servicios de Hernando de Soto; Testamento de Doña Leonor Coya; Poder otorgado por Hernando de Soto a Hernán Ponce de León, para que pudiera desempeñar sus Derechos en las Sedas de Granada; Testamento de Adelantado Hernando de Soto; Inventario y Almoneda de los Bienes que dejó el Adelantado Hernando de Soto; Relación de las Personas que pasaron a la Florida para la Empresa de Hernando de Soto.

These appendices are taken in great part from originals in the Archivo de Indias, most of them being part of a large expediente in 50-2-55/10. The Florida State Historical Society has a photostat copy of the original, which contains much more material than is included in the volume under review. The book especially was of considerable use to the present reviewer while he was editing his translation of the *Relaçam* of the unknown Fidalgo of Elvas. The last appendix is of especial importance as it gives details of the men who went with Soto on his expedition. It is hoped that more materials of this nature will come from Badajoz. The editors of this volume have furnished an important service to students in the United States, although their chief motive was to glorify Extremadura. Whenever the reviewer works with a book of this nature compiled in Spain, Por-

tugal, or Hispanic America, he sighs for an index. Its lack in the present instance is the only drawback to the volume.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

Mexico before Cortez: An Account of the daily Life, Religion, and Ritual of the Aztecs and kindred Peoples. By J. ERIC THOMPSON. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933. Pp. 4, 298. Illus. \$2.50.)

A History of Ancient Mexico. By FRAY BERNARDINO DE SAHAGUN. Translated by FANNY R. BANDELIER from the Spanish Version of Carlos María de Bustamante. Vol. I. (Nashville: Fisk University Press, 1932. Pp. ix, 315.)

The first of these two books is an excellent and informative volume, exactly suited to the needs of the historical and general student of things Mexican. Its author is a recognized archaeologist, who is well known for his work in his chosen field. In this account, he has wisely avoided technical terms and has produced a volume which can be understood without too much special study—just the sort of a book the general public should have on early Mexico. The term "Mexican" is here made to include the "Aztecs, Texcocans, and other tribes of the Valley of Mexico and adjacent regions who possessed the same general culture with minor local variations", but "does not cover Oaxaca, Vera Cruz, Michoacan, and other regions where local culture varied to a greater degree from that of the Aztecs". The author has endeavored to make his volume complementary to T. A. Joyce's *Mexican Archaeology*. The book consists of eight chapters, namely: A historical outline; The cycle of life; Arts and crafts; Social organization, War, and Trade; Religion; The Calēndars and the feasts; Priesthood, sports, and writings; and Temples and tombs. There is also a selected bibliography, mostly of modern books, although some of the old chronicles are mentioned. He notes that there are English editions of Peter Martyr, Herrera, Gómara, and Acosta; and French and German translations of Sahagun, not knowing at the time of his writing, evidently of the English translation of Sahagun by Mrs. Bandelier; nor does he mention that Kingsborough in his monumental work used Sahagun extensively. He notes that Torquemada and Durán, alone of the great historians have not been

translated from the Spanish. But he should have noted that while as early as twenty years ago, this was a severe stricture because so comparatively few scholars read Spanish easily, this is no longer true for Spanish is well understood by many people at the present day—desirable as it may be for all the great chronicles to be translated into English. The volume throughout is sane and balanced. The chapter on religion, with its description of the various Mexican gods, and that on the calendar and feasts throw much light on Mexican history. In fact, the entire book conduces to further study. A serious fault in proofreading is noted on p. 66, where the text reads: "The following day the *ideals* [italics mine] were ceremonially eaten"—the word should be "idols" of course. It might be noted that the slavery for debt, described on p. 113 is not unlike that of the Philippine Islands. Merchants used the arm of a female monkey for good luck instead of the rabbit's foot (p. 229). Another analogy is in the game of ball as played in Mexico and in ancient Florida—was there any connection between the two? Very happily, Dr. Thompson describes the archaeologist as the ragpicker of ancient history (p. 252). On p. 253, in an effort to appear easy in style, he uses the colloquial "Doesn't". His statements (p. 285) that "it is doubtful if much in Mexican culture can be attributed directly to the Maya" and "Maya civilization was a late specialized development, and there is little reason to credit the hoary antiquity usually attributed to it" approach in some manner the statements of Leo Wiener in his *Mexican and Mayan Origins*. Very properly he declaims against the rubbish published by the proponents of certain theories—"theories put forward by cranks or persons with no real knowledge of aboriginal American culture" (p. 287). The work should be read by all students of Hispanic American history.

Mrs. Bandelier's book is a source book on early Mexican history and antiquities and gives the student for the first time in English dress the work of the great Spanish Franciscan Fray Bernardino de Sahagun. The volume is fittingly dedicated to the memory of Mrs. Bandelier's husband, the great Americanist, Adolph Bandelier. The volume is preceded by a short foreword by Clark Wissler, who calls Sahagun "the first ethnologist" of the new world because of the scientific methods of his work. The volume has a short preface by Mrs. Bandelier and a biography of Fray Bernardino de Sahagun. The

Franciscan friar was well equipped for his work, learning Aztec so thoroughly that he wrote his books in that language and later translated them into Spanish. Sahagun has for so long been recognized as the great authority on early Mexican social life and customs that it is superfluous to speak of the importance of his work. His manuscript was used by Herrera, Torquemada, and Durán and in later days, the great authority Kingsborough made extensive use of him. In this volume only the first four books of his narrative are given, together with a bibliography of his writings taken from García Icazbalceta's *Bibliografía Mexicana del Siglo XVI* (Mexico, 1866). It is expected the rest of the narrative and an amplification of the bibliography will appear in the second volume of this work. In translating this work, Mrs. Bandelier has performed a very necessary and important piece of work. Her translation appears to be well made. The annotations might well have been more numerous, but to have an English text is after all the most important. The omission of a table of contents was probably an oversight. There is a good index.

JAMES ALEXANDER ROBERTSON.

NOTES AND COMMENT

PORTO BELLO, PUERTO BELLO, OR PORTOBELLO?

The field of Hispanic-American history presents a variety of minor problems which are being solved slowly but surely through laborious research. Yet, even a casual reading of a number of general books on Hispanic-American history will reveal numerous differences as to dates, names, and many other details.

For example, was the voyage of Gil Eannes made in 1434 or 1433? Was Balboa decapitated in 1517, 1518, or 1519? Did Jacques make his voyage to Brazil in 1525 or 1526? When was Mendoza, Argentina, founded? Some authorities say 1559, some 1560, and still others 1561. Did Pizarro get a booty at Cuzco four times as much as he obtained from Atahualpa, or about the same amount? Did Cau-policán hold the beam forty-eight hours, or did he hold it at all? Was the population of Spanish America 13,500,000 in 1810, or was it about 17,000,000? Was Villegagnon a Catholic, a Calvinist, or a Lutheran, and when in each case? Should one say Benalcázar, Belalcázar, Benalcázer, or Moyano? Did the British lose 18,000 or 1,800 in their attack on Cartagena? Is it Mem de Sa, or Men de Sa? Do Portuguese names carry the accent or do they not? Did Ceballos, or Zeballos, have an army of nine thousand or twenty-one thousand when he took Colonia in 1776?

These are just a few examples of differences in detail out of hundreds which might be adduced. All were taken from books on Hispanic America. And how about Porto Bello, the famous old entrepôt on the north side of the isthmus of Panama? Should it be written Puerto Bello, Puerto Velo, Portovelo, Portobelo, or Porto Bello?

When Columbus discovered the bay in 1502 he named it Puerto Bello (Beautiful Harbor), on account of the attractive sight it presents to the mariner, who is unaware of the treacherous climate of the region. In March, 1597, Francisco Valverde y Mercado founded a town within the harbor, to take the place of Nombre de Dios which had recently been destroyed by the English. The town took the name of the harbor, the name of which, meanwhile, must have been changed

to Portobelo. When this metamorphosis took place is not definitely known to the writer, but one may be quite certain that the name had crystallized into Portobelo by the time the town proper was founded. Of this we have some evidence in the writings of Herrera y Tordesillas. Herrera's first two volumes of his *Historia general* were printed in 1601—only about five years from the founding of Porto Bello. Yet Herrera's spelling is *Portobelo*.

In reaching this conclusion, Spanish-speaking historians alone have been consulted, covering every century beginning with the seventeenth. All the authorities listed below spell the name Portobelo.¹ However, other forms have been met with in the process of this research. Some writers have rendered it Puerto Bello; some Porto Bello; others have used Puerto Velo, or Portovelo, but such renderings are rare, and unusually so as we approach the twentieth century. The Spanish-speaking peoples today call it Portobelo. This has been attested by a consultation of books and maps recently published in Spanish and by a letter of Adolfo Alemán V., Panamanian consul at San Francisco, to Professor Charles E. Chapman of the University of California, which in part reads: "The name is Portobelo, which means 'puerto bello'. Portovelo is a mistaken spelling of the word Portobelo".

It is to be noted here that *Puerto Bello* would be the normal and correct way a Spaniard would spell the name. What, then, influenced the Spaniards to render it Portobelo? This is a problem for which research so far has not been able to offer an authoritative solution.

And now that the correct Spanish name of the town has been ascertained, it is for the individual historian to decide whether he will

¹ The following authorities have been consulted:

1. Alfaro, Olmedo. *El canal de Panamá en las guerras futuras*. Guayaquil, 1930.
2. Biedma, Juan de (and) Beyer, Carlos. *Atlas histórico de la república argentina*. Buenos Aires, 1909.
3. *Diccionario geográfico-histórico de las Indias occidentales ó América*. 4 v. Madrid, 1788.
4. Fernández, Félix. *Derrotero de las islas Antillas*. Mexico, 1825.
5. Herrera y Tordesillas, Antonio de. *Historia general*. 4 v. Madrid, 1601-1615.
6. López, Juan. *Provincia de Panamá*. 1789? Map in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
7. *Mapa de Panamá, Portobelo, Darién*, [etc.], 1600? Archivo General de Indias, Seville, Spain. Photostat in Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

adopt Puerto Bello, Portobelo, or Porto Bello as the preferable form in English historical literature.

DOMINIC SALANDRA.

University of California,
Berkeley.

WHITE INDIANS

When I first read about the discovery of a tribe of white Indians in the northwestern part of Paraguay, the matter did not interest me in the least, for I am accustomed to these notices of discoveries which are never confirmed, and which are nothing more than the fantasy of gullible explorers. But now that Harvard has repudiated the story of this discovery of the young ethnologist, who has been called an "inexperienced amateur", and papers like the *Transcript* have had editorials on it, it has occurred to me that further annotations apropos of this legend of white Indians, which not for the first time has appeared in print, might be of interest.

Virgin America has always been full of the most fantastic legends—the fountain of youth, which Ponce de León sought; El Dorado, in the search for which so many audacious Spanish conquistadores died: the Amazons, those warlike women, lost in the jungles of the river which today bears their name; and the white Indians, all of which have filled innumerable pages of our history.

The fountain of youth, according to the commercial propaganda of certain sections, like Florida, has been found in the excellence of their climates; some hygienists have found it in their systems, while others claim that Dr. Voronoff, with his transplanting of glands has at last found the origin of that "divine treasure".

El Dorado was nothing more than a product of the torrid imaginations of the Spanish conquistadores. This legend had its origin in the religious ceremonies of the Guatavita Indians of the Chibcha nation, in what is today Colombia, when, in their offerings to their gods, they immersed one of their "caciques", his body dusted with the precious metal, in the limpid waters of the sacred lagoon. A description of this fantastic and primitive ceremony can be found in the chronicles of the conquistador Juan Rodríguez Fresle, to whom the story of this tradition was passed on by the descendants of the Guatavitas.

The legend of the Amazons is one which many of the historians of the Conquest dwelt upon, but the origin of which really cannot be traced, and which is paralleled only in Greek mythology. By an inexplicable coincidence, the primitive inhabitants of America, long before the Spaniards crossed the ocean, talked of the Amazons, fabulous, white women, whom they called "Comapuyares", that is, "women with one breast mutilated". Other Indians called them "Cuñantenfecuina" ("women without husbands").

Colombus heard very vague reports of these women in the Caribbean Islands; Orellano, one of the first explorers of the Amazonian regions, said he found these women coming down the Marañón River. When he arrived in Spain, there was so much noise made about the discovery of these fabulous women, that in Europe they ended by giving the name of the Amazon to the great river in South America, instead of the name of its discoverer. The Jesuit Christoval de Acuña left a little book with delightful details about this matter. Speaking of the Amazons he says:

They are women of great valor, who have always kept apart from the ordinary contacts with men, and although they have agreed that men should come to their lands once a year, they received them with weapons in their hands—namely, bows and arrows—and do not loose their hold on them until they are satisfied that the men are known to them and had come in peace; and leaving their weapons, they all get into the canoes or boats of the guests, take their hammocks, carry them to their houses, hang them where the owner knows he is received as a guest, and after a few days they return to their country; but they repeat this trip every year at the same time. The daughters that are born from this union are kept and brought up, but it is not certain what they do with the boys who are born to them.

Antonio de Herrera, in his *Décadas de la Conquista*, speaking of these extraordinary women of aboriginal America, says:

Padre Fray Gaspar de Carvajal affirms that he and the others saw ten or twelve Amazons fighting at the head of the Indians as captains, so courageously that the Indians did not dare turn back, and he who fled before the Castilians was beaten to death. These women seemed to them very tall, robust, and white, with very long hair, braided and coiled about the head, naked, their secret parts covered, their bows and arrows in their hands.

Indians in America who look like the Japanese or Malaysians do not surprise anyone. There have been many conjectures regarding the origin of these races. Nor do the white Indians surprise us. We have

seen them right here at New England fairs. They are "mestizos", halfbreeds, who exist in all parts of this continent, absorbed by civilization, and there are others who, for explicable reasons, may not be connected with civilization, but they never form compact and extensive tribes. Ever since the first days of the conquest there have been extraordinary cases of white men lost in the jungles who have gone native and mingled freely with the Indians.

Solis, in his admirable history of the conquest of Mexico, tells us how Cortés, upon arriving at the Isle of Cozumel, on his way to the conquest of the Aztec Empire, heard of the existence of white men in Yucatan, a territory which had not yet been visited by any Spanish expedition. Some days later he succeeded in redeeming Jerónimo de Aguilar, who was such a help to him later as an interpreter in the conquest of Mexico. This Aguilar was from Ecija, in Spain. With twenty other companions he crossed from Darien to Santo Domingo, lands already settled by the Spaniards, but they were shipwrecked, and were washed to the shores of Yucatan, where they fell into the hands of cannibal tribes. Most of them were sacrificed to idols, and were later eaten. The leaner ones, among them, Aguilar, were separately put into a sort of cage, where they were fattened for a second festival. Aguilar escaped, fled as best he could, and came to an enemy tribe, and as he was very useful to them, he gained their confidence and saved his life. When the Spaniards found him after eight years of living in the jungles, he was a completely primitive man, painted like the other Indians, carrying his quiver of arrows and speaking Castilian with great difficulty.

Another Spaniard, Gonzalo Guerrero, one of Aguilar's companions, refused to join his compatriots, and preferred the primitive life of the forests. Believing that he was lost forever, he had married a wealthy Indian woman, and had four children by her whom he loved and to whom he preferred to be faithful.

In Colombia, my country, we also have the legends of white Indians. It is about the indomitable Motilón tribe who live as independently as in the days prior to the conquest. They live on the slopes of the Andes, between Colombia and Venezuela, a little to the south of Goajira and not far from the Lake of Maracaibo, where large oil deposits have been found, and their deadly arrows shot from the

mysterious forests make them feared even today by the oil men there, who have to exercise great care and precaution in those regions.

The Motilón Indians are tall and robust, and many of them have brown eyes and light hair. They have an ineradicable hatred for the white man, who has not yet been able to tame them. The reasons for these physical characteristics is clearly found in the pages of history: The Motilones, like many other tribes, fell unexpectedly, like an avalanche, upon several Spanish settlements. They killed the men, stole all they could, destroyed everything that was left, and dragged the women and children off with them. No one ever heard of those unfortunates again, who, like Aguilar and Guerrero in Yucatan, having lost all hope, ended by adopting the life of the savage and even came to love the jungle and their primitive companions.

This explains the present story of white Indians. They are mere incidents in the process of the human race. The paternity of these discoveries is like innumerable others.

ENRIQUE NARANJO M.

Honorary Consul of Colombia,
Boston, Mass.

There has recently been founded in San Antonio, Texas, a society for historical research, to which the name "Yanaguana Society" has been given. The principal aim of the society is the collection, preservation, and publication of manuscripts relating to the history of San Antonio. The name of the new organization arises from the name of the village of the Payaya Indians, the site of which was that of the present San Antonio when the Teran Expedition arrived there in 1691. The society is governed by a board of directors, those for 1933-1934 being William Aubrey, Sr., Frederic C. Chabot, Rena Maverick Green, Harry Hertzberg, Eleanor Onderdonk, Albert Stevens, Sr., and Frost Woodhull. At the first annual meeting held on October 18, 1933, officers were elected as follows: president, William Aubrey, Sr.; vice-presidents, G. C. Carvajal, John A. James, John O. Meusebach, Mrs. B. M. Farnsworth, Mrs. María Pérez House, Mrs. Lucie Tobin Thornton, Ferdinand P. Herff, and Trinidad Wulff; secretary, Frederick C. Chabot; treasurer, Miss Mary F. Norton. Professors Herbert E. Bolton and Charles W. Hackett were unanimously elected honorary members. Twenty-eight Fellows, who

have shown by published work special aptitude for historical investigation, four benefactors, who have presented certain manuscripts to the society, and a number of honorary sponsors were also elected. Among manuscripts for publication are the following: "Index to the Bexar Archives", the Werzbach "Diary", and translations of manuscripts, the originals of which are in the Franciscan convent in Mexico, all by Carlos E. Castañeda; "Early Texas maps", by Castañeda and Chabot; and "The Powerful Aguayos", and "With the Makers of San Antonio", by Frederick C. Chabot. There is no initiation fee, the only fee being an annual membership fee of three dollars. Copies of all publications will be furnished to subscribing members. Both Mr. Chabot and Dr. Castañeda have long been interested in the history of San Antonio and each has published materials of interest about Texas and San Antonio. Active local historical societies can exert a great deal of effective force, provided they do not lend themselves to the perpetuation of historical fiction—of which a number of local societies have been guilty. A long and useful life is hoped for the new society under the enthusiastic direction of its board of directors and its secretary.

Dr. Albert Rangel, who is living in Paris, is working on a biography of Prince Louis Gaston d'Orléans, Conde d'Eu.—M. M. W.

Professor Mary Wilhelmine Williams of Goucher College spent the past summer in France, Portugal, and Brazil gathering materials for her proposed biography of Dom Pedro II. of Brazil. At the Chateau d'Eu, Normandy, she examined the Orleans-Bragança archives, which are in the possession of Prince Pedro d'Alcantara, son of the Princess Imperial Isabel of Brazil and the Comte d'Eu, and grandson of Pedro II.

Among the important decrees issued during the past summer by the Provisional Government of Brazil is one of special interest to students of history and the fine arts. The venerable city of Ouro Preto has been declared a national monument. In taking this step Brazil has followed the precedent set by Spain in the case of Granada, Peru in the case of Cuzco, and Mexico as regards Taxco. It will be recalled that Ouro Preto was the capital of Minas Geraes until 1897 when this distinction was conferred upon the city Bello Horizonte,

constructed for this particular purpose. Villa Rica de Ouro Preto—to use the original designation—is one of the most celebrated historical sites not only of Brazil but of all South America. As is well known it was established as a result of the discovery and exploration of the diamond mines of Minas Geraes in the early eighteenth century. Here took place at the end of the same century the premature rebellion against Portugal known as the *Inconfidencia Mineira*, which resulted in the martyrdom of Tiradentes. In fact, there have been few great movements in Brazilian history in which Ouro Preto has not had some share. This venerable colonial city also possesses a rich artistic patrimony, especially in the domain of religious art. Particularly notable are the works of Antonio Francisco Lisboa, known as *O Aleijadinho*, beyond question the greatest sculptor produced by Brazil. Numerous churches and monumental public buildings also serve as mute reminders of the halcyon days of colonial Brazil. In putting this invaluable historical and artistic legacy under the direct custodianship of the Brazilian nation the Provisional Government places all future generations in its debt.—P. A. M.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

RECENT GERMAN LITERATURE ON HISPANIC AMERICA

In the German speaking countries it is only in the Ibero-Amerikanische Institute of Germany that we find systematic scientific research on Hispanic America. And here it is economics rather than history that is being made the subject of investigation. Thus, setting aside the publications relative to ancient American art appearing in numerous periodicals, we find only a small number of historical studies, whereas the number of works on geography, politics, economics, and chiefly of accounts of travels is very considerable. Following is given a general survey of recent German publications.

SOURCES

The publishing of historical sources is comparatively infrequent. This has been done only by Brockhaus, Leipzig, the well known publishers of the Brockhaus *Encyclopedia*, that deals, however, so masterfully with Hispanic American matters. Brockhaus has published some sources in a popular edition under the series title "Alte Reisen und Abenteuer"; which have been translated, abridged, and partly rearranged. One account is Fernando de Alva Ixtlixochitl's *Historia Chichimeca*. In another, *Francisco Pizarro, Der Sturz des Incareiches*, a descendant of the Incas and a Spanish Jesuit relate, each from his own point of view, the events of the time of Pizarro. The text of the volume *Als Freibeuter in Amerika*, is preceded by a general survey of Drake's voyages by the editor, and followed by a translation of passages of Hawkins's record of his voyage to Guinea and the West Indies, of Chaplain Fletcher's account of the voyage through the Straits of Magellan and of Nuño de Silva's statements before the

court of the inquisition at Mexico. Professor Lehmann-Nitzsche (La Plata) has published the account of Hans Staden under the title *Hans Staden, ein deutscher Landsknecht in der Neuen Welt*. Dr. Curt Cramer has rearranged Ulrich Schmidel's record of his adventures in South America (1535-1554). All these books contain reproductions of old engravings and numerous photographs.

In any account of historic sources one should not omit mention of the hymns and tales which the peoples of America have left us. Of most of these we have a very literal rendering, partly from first, but mostly from second hand. However, it is very satisfying to learn that the publishing house of Diederichs at Jena has undertaken, in spite of the high cost, to produce adequate translations, of such materials so far as this is scientifically possible. On the basis of Eduard Seler's highly literal rendering, J. W. Schottelius and R. Freud have presented translations of Mexican hymns out of the twelve volumes of the *Historia general de los Cosas de Nueva España* of Padre Fray Bernardino de Sahagun (*Alt-Mexikanische Hymnen*, Jena, Diederichs Verlag, 1928). This edition contains two essays of Schottelius on the problem of the form of the religious songs of the early Mexicans and on their mythology and ideas of the world.

To the series "Märchen der Weltliteratur" of the same publishers, W. Krickeberg contributes: *Märchen der Azteken, Inkas, Mayas und Muiscas*. Krickeberg tries to give an adequate rendering of the meaning of these tales, by translating them very carefully. There is an introduction to the tales and they are fully explained. It may be mentioned that in 1927 there appeared a collection of tales of the Indians of South America, translated and with an introduction by T. Koch-Grünberg (Jena, Diederichs). It is needless to say anything of the difficult task of the editors of these tales. They are entitled to our gratitude for having made them understandable.

HISTORICAL WORKS

Among the historical standard works which also deal with Hispanic America, one must mention the *Museum der Weltgeschichte*. The discovery and colonization of Hispanic America are discussed by Dr. Adolf Rein, Professor at the University of Hamburg (A. Rein, *Die europäische Ausbreitung über die Erde*. Wildpark, Potsdam, Germany. Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1931, pp. 406). The book, with its 262 text illustrations, 22 plates, and a number of maps, the publication of which in this connection is a real service, could very well serve as a history of Hispanic American civilization. In spite of its rich illustration, the volume is in no way a book for mere entertainment. The discovery and colonization are not dealt with as an isolated problem by Dr. Rein; he constantly links up these matters with the general history of colonization. Only matters of importance for the general problem of colonization and the history of the world are related here. All onesidedness in the point of view is strictly avoided. Written from a wealth of experience and great knowledge, this book is proof of its author's breadth of mind. Current opinions, as they are still to be found in school-books are corrected. Yet, in spite of its scientific thoroughness this book reads like a story. The new way of looking at things, the subordination of the whole matter under one great leading idea, made it possible to treat such a large subject on a comparatively small scale. A well selected bibliography concludes this engaging work.

A small publication by Francisco J. Montalban, S. J., (*Das spanische Patronat und die Eroberung der Philippinen*, Freiburg, i.B., Herder & Co., 1931 pp. 131) represents a study of real value on Spanish colonial policy. The author, a Spanish Jesuit, has worked through more than 40,000 documents at the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. He states clearly the right of conquest at the time of the Spanish voyages of discovery, and investigates the claims of Portugal, the wearisome

negotiations between Spain and Portugal, and the problem of the Moluccas. In the second part of his book, Montalban discusses the ideals of the conquerors, expounding the methods of conquest, dealing with the problem of the missions, and discussing the question of commerce. He arrives at the conclusion that a careful study of the documents reveals the essentially missionary character of the work of these explorers.

The figure of Toussaint l'Ouverture will always inspire the historian. The following book of Karl Otten (*Der schwarze Napoleon*, Berlin, Atlantis-Verlag, 1931, pp. 371) neither completes nor replaces an earlier work on the same subject. It is really a romantic biography and as such very lively, not wanting thrilling situations which are historically true. Toussaint l'Ouverture is still a psychological puzzle. Yet Otten is not concerned with it. Concealing successfully his sympathy for his hero, he gives a most favorable picture of him. It may be said that this well written historico-biographical novel gives a generally truthful account of that period.

POLITICAL WORKS

Joseph März's book, *Die Ozeane in der Politik und Staatenbildung* (Breslau, F. Hirt, 1931, pp. 120) has more methodical than historical character. Its aim is to explain to the continentally-minded man the political importance of the oceans and the influence of the sea and of parts of it in the formation of political conditions. The powerfactor (*Machtfaktor*) "sea" is of considerable importance for Hispanic American history, particularly the Isthmus of Panama, the United States with its coasts on different oceans, Central America, and the West Indies. The aspiration of states to get to the sea has led to several wars, as, for instance, that between Bolivia and Chile, 1879-1883. Though the text of this book is short, it is a very stimulating one for the historian. It contains thirty-six sketches of maps.

K. v. Schumacher records in his book (*Mexiko und die Staaten Zentralamerikas*, Zürich, Orell Füssli Verlag, pp. 174) the results of a journey. He tells us nothing new, but the manner in which he writes the volume is very sympathetic. He has written this book for Europeans, and as such it fulfils its purpose admirably. It contains all that is of importance in the history, population, policy, religion, army, and economics. A chronology of Mexican and Central American history is a useful help to the reader. The book contains also two economic, and one historical, maps; unfortunately there is no bibliography and no list of sources, two things that should never be wanting in a work that is designed to be an introduction.

GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOLOGY

Historical investigation always leads us back to a renewed study of the geographical facts. O. Schmieder's description of South America (*Länderkunde Südamerikas*, Leipzig and Wien, Franz Deuticke, 1932, pp. 252) is a masterly work of this kind. The author, who was in Chile in 1914, then, from 1916 during six years Professor at Córdoba (Argentina), and from 1925-1930 at the University of California, at Berkeley, has had ample opportunity for a thorough study of his subject. His object is a description of the evolution of South-America's different areas of civilization. He distinguishes so-called "Grosslandschaften" which he describes briefly but exhaustively. Take, as an example, the Central Andes. We find chapters on the geology, the types of landscape (Landformen), the climate, the vegetation, the tribes and the character of their civilization, the influence of Spanish culture, and the development during the modern epoch. The historian will find much interesting matter in this book and the politician a sound basis for the understanding of political life. The appendix contains a comprehensive bibliography and numerous photographs.

Of all the voyages of discovery with a really scientific pur-

pose, Professor Böker's book, (Hans Böker *Tiere in Brasilien*, Strecker und Schröder, Stuttgart 1932, pp. 309) merits perhaps most consideration. This work is not written from the ethnological, but the biological point of view. We explore with the author the Sertao of Ceara, the Campos in Marajo, the virgin forest of the lower Amazonas. The author tells us amply of the preparations, the equipment, and the work accomplished. The book is perhaps as important for the historian as the zoölogist, as one can learn a good deal about life in the countries explored. The book is written throughout in a spirit of minute accuracy and it may fairly be called one of the best books of its kind. It contains 100 photographs, some sketch maps, and two excellent indexes.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize the importance of the problem of communication in South America. In W. Teubert's book (*Die Welt im Querschnitt des Verkehrs*, Berlin, 1928, pp. 512) the author deals with this matter in 250 pages. For this purpose he undertook a world cruise in 1925-1926. His principal subject is the part played by traffic in the economic structure of South America and he is chiefly interested with the possibility of coöperation with Germany. For mere reading purposes the book may be too voluminous, but as a handbook it will prove serviceable also to the historian, though the problems are often only summarily dealt with. The bibliography is not satisfactory, but the 186 pictures and 52 maps and sketches are a valuable addition to the work.

German scientists frequently choose the life of South American Indians as an object of their studies. In his book (*Indianer Studien im nordöstlichen Chaco*, C. L. Hirschfeld, Leipzig, 1931, pp. 230) H. Baldus has put down the results of two journeys to the Chaco in 1923 and 1928. He deals with two tribes only, the Tschamakoko, a tribe of hunters and gatherers, and the Kaskiha, a settled tribe of peasants. The work is divided into chapters dealing with the camp, clothing, food, arms, commerce, social problems, religion, games, psychology, character, and language. Thus this book is a real encyclopedia

of these two tribes and there is nothing wanting that could be said about these Indians. The author has an excellent knowledge of the literature, a list of which he has added to his work. He even makes an attempt to give us the history of these two tribes, but confines himself frequently to quotations from the sources. The book will be, therefore, very useful to a future historian of the Indian tribes in the Gran Chaco.

TRAVEL

Travel books, if they do not confine themselves strictly to landscape description, easily become political books. Such works usually quickly lose a good deal of their original value, if they are not written, as the present book (Kasimir Edschmid, *Glanz und Elend Südamerikas*, Societäts-Verlag, Frankfurt a.M., 1931, pp. 480) by an author of great power of observation and surprising intuition. We get a really splendid insight into the situation of almost all the South American States before the revolutions of 1930. Edschmid's book contains really the best things that were ever written in travel books on South America and the book will be delightful reading even for the historian.

Lajos Steiner's book (*Unter Palmen, Bohrtürmen und Wolkenkratzen*, Strecker und Schröder, Stuttgart 1932, pp. 169) may perhaps serve as a first guide in the Caribbean sea. The book, written as a diary, does not tell us much. The crossing over the ocean has been described too often and more interestingly than in this book. Historical statements are scarce. No mention is made of the work done by the author. The contents of this book are probably too poor even to serve as a guide for inexperienced travelers. Maps and bibliography are wanting.

HANS W. HARTMANN.

Kilchberg b. Zürich, Switzerland.

A TOPICAL ANALYSIS OF THE COLLEGE TEXTS ON HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORY

In the field of Hispanic American history, six college textbooks have been written. They are as follows, listed in the order of their appearance:

- (1) *A History of Latin America*, by William Warren Sweet, 1919. Latest edition, 1929.
- (2) *History of the Latin American Nations*, by William Spence Robertson, 1922. Latest edition, 1932.
- (3) *The Republics of Latin America; their History, Government, and Economic Conditions*, by Herman G. James and Percy A. Martin, 1923.
- (4) *The People and Politics of Latin America*, by Mary W. Williams, 1930.
- (5) *A History of Hispanic America*, by A. Curtis Wilgus, 1931.
- (6) *Historical Evolution of Hispanic America*, by J. Fred Rippey, 1932.

This analysis is based upon a study of the latest editions of these works, with the object of comparing them as to topical content through statistical analysis, in order to discover how much space each text devotes to the various phases of Hispanic American history. This information is given in the accompanying tables, the written portion of the analysis being merely an explanatory introduction.

The method employed in dividing this field of history for the purposes of this study is somewhat arbitrary, although all of the books follow a similar general plan in their composition. The classification of the several portions of each work has also necessitated division according to personal viewpoint in certain cases, but no partiality or bias has been intended in any case.

Table 1 constitutes the main body of this analysis. The field has been divided into five portions, four of which—(I) The Colonial Period, (II) The Revolutions for Independence, (III) Histories of Individual States since Independence, and (V) International Relationships—are clearly defined units. To the fourth, Modern Hispanic American Civilization, has been assigned chapters which could not be properly classified with the above. In the more detailed division, a dash is used to indicate that no particular portion has been found in a work which might be classified under one of the headings. In some cases this may mean that the subject is treated with another, and

has been classified with the latter. Thus in Professor Williams's book, there was no specific section dealing with Hispanic American relations with Europe, but this was considered as part of the individual histories of the particular countries. On the other hand, while Dr. Wilgus's work deals with European relations in this manner also, it also deals with them separately in a subsequent separate section. This is likewise true of the other volumes.

In the first section—The Colonial Period—there is little need for explanation, as all the works follow a similar outline. Under the Revolutionary Period, the only explanation necessary is in regard to divisions D and E. Division D includes portions of the works dealing with the political, social, and economic problems of the new states in general after their independence was secured, and prior to the consideration of their individual histories as independent states. Section E has been inserted in order to classify properly a chapter of Professor Rippy's book on the activities of the European states *during* the independence movements. The other works include such consideration directly with the account of the revolutions under sections B and C. Accounts of post-independence problems of recognition and other international relationships are included in the last section. The third section—Individual Country Surveys—needs no explanation, save that several of the books include as part of the individual country surveys topics which are separately considered in sections four and five. On the contrary, Professor Williams gives in a separate chapter, which has been classified in section four, the history of Hispanic American Literature and Art, whereas the other works have taken this up in the country surveys. In section four—Modern Hispanic American Civilization—A and B need no explanation; division C—Forms of Government—includes only general consideration of Hispanic American political forms; such material for individual countries is included in section 3. Section five needs little comment; a subdivision of part D—European Relationships—has been undertaken only in connection with Professor Rippy's book, which deals separately and in detail with this subject.

In summary, the following condensed table shows the percentage of the whole of each work which is devoted to the particular sections. The median has not been included so as to indicate an ideal average,

or anything of the sort, but as merely indicative of the average division of texts such as these in the several phases or periods of the field.

	I Sweet	II Robertson	III James and Martin	IV Williams	V Wilgus	VI Rippy	Median
I. Colonial Period.	38.6	27.6	15.9	34.5	32.7	22.9	28.7
II. Independence Movements..	10.3	6.9	7.6	8.4	10.0	14.0	9.5
III. Individual Country Surveys.	26.3	57.0	66.9	48.7	33.8	23.3	42.7
IV. Modern Hispanic American Civilization.	17.1	2.0	5.9	2.0	6.3	5.5
V. International Relationships.	7.7	6.5	9.6	2.5	21.5	33.5	11.9

Table 2 gives some other comparative data, which may be explained as follows:

Item 1 includes only the pages of written text material.

Item 2 is an estimate made through counting a number of full pages of the text, obtaining an average number of words per full page, and then deducting a certain proportion to allow for short pages at the beginnings and endings of chapters. This gives, of course, only an approximate average of words per page.

Item 3 is obtained by multiplying Items 1 and 2. This number of words does not include those in the introduction, reference lists, appendices, or indices.

Items 4, 5, and 6 are self explanatory; it should be pointed out, however, that these totals are not strictly comparable, for in the references and indexing, close printing may include double the amount of material in one book to that in the same space in another. Nevertheless, it is probable that Items 4 and 6 reflect fairly accurately the relative amount of such material (references and indices) included in each work.

Item 7 is the sum of Items 1, 4, 5, and 6. It does not include pages in the preface or table of contents, nor does it include pages of maps in the main body of the text.

Item 8 has been selected as the fairest way of comparing the map material of these four texts, the number only being considered.

Table 3 is self explanatory.

In conclusion, it should be stated that this statistical comparison is in no sense an attempt at a complete evaluation of these volumes. This analysis represents only one avenue of textbook evaluation, and must be supplemented by a critical study of the contents of each individual work.

TABLE 1

A COMPARATIVE TOPICAL ANALYSIS OF THE COLLEGE TEXTS ON HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORY

	Sweet		Robertson		James and Martin		Williams		Wilgus		Rippy	
	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent
I. Colonial Period.....	135	38.6	203	27.6	78	15.9	275	34.5	184	32.7	120	22.9
A. Backgrounds.....	26	7.4	63	8.6	26	5.3	101	12.7	44	7.8	41	7.7
a. Geographical.....	7	2.0	11	1.5	16	2.0	12	2.1	15	2.9
b. Ethnological.....	4	1.1	27	3.7	6	1.2	47	5.9	17	3.0	12	2.3
c. European.....	15	4.3	25	3.4	20	4.1	38	4.8	15	2.4	14	2.7
B. Exploration and Expansion in Spain and Portugal, 15th and 16th centuries.....	56	16.0	57	7.7	6	1.2	47	5.9	59	10.5	25	4.8
C. Spanish Colonial Life in 17th and 18th Centuries.....	21	6.0	35	4.7	17	3.4	52	6.5	13	2.3	17	3.2
a. Economic.....	11	3.1	13	1.8	6	1.2	16	2.0	5	.9	4	.8
b. Intellectual.....	2	.6	17	2.3	3	.6	19	2.4	4	.7	5	1.0
c. Social.....	8	2.3	5	.6	8	3.6	17	2.1	4	.7	8	1.4
D. Spanish Colonial Administration in 17th and 18th Century....	27	7.7	27	3.7	15	3.1	44	5.5	40	7.1	20	3.9
a. Political.....	18	5.1	16	2.2	8	1.6	15	1.9	26	4.6	10	1.9
b. Economic.....	5	1.5	4	.5	4	.9	15	1.9	8	1.4	5	1.0
c. Social.....	4	1.1	7	1.0	3	.6	14	1.8	6	1.1	5	1.0
E. The Portuguese in Brazil.....	5	1.5	21	2.9	14	2.9	31	3.9	28	5.0	17	3.3
a. Colonial Life.....	3	.9	12	1.6	5	1.0	18	2.3	18	3.2	10	1.9
b. Colonial Administration.....	2	.6	9	1.3	9	1.9	13	1.6	10	1.8	7	1.3
II. The Revolutions for Independence ..	36	10.3	51	6.9	37	7.6	67	8.4	56	10.0	73	14.0
A. Backgrounds.....	7	2.0	7	.9	3	.6	7	.9	9	1.6	6	1.1
B. Early Revolutionary Movements	3	.6	7	1.2	3	.6
C. Independence Movements.....	29	8.3	35	4.8	26	5.3	41	5.1	40	7.2	22	4.2
a. In Northern South America ..	8	2.3	8	1.1	10	2.0	8	1.0	12	2.2	7	1.3
b. In Southern South America ..	8	2.3	8	1.1	9	1.9	10	1.3	12	2.2	5	1.0
c. In Southern North America ..	8	2.3	7	1.0	4	.8	6	.7	9	1.6	6	1.1
d. In Brazil.....	4	1.1	7	1.0	2	.4	4	.5	4	.7	3	.7
e. In Haiti and Sto. Domingo...	1	.3	5	.6	1	.2	13	1.6	3	.5	3	.1
D. Problems of Independence.....	9	1.2	5	1.1	19	2.4	17	3.3
E. The Western Powers and the Independence Movement.....	25	4.8
III. Histories and Surveys of Individual Countries since Independence...	92	26.3	420	57.0	328	66.9	388	48.7	190	33.8	122	23.3
A. Brazil.....	14	4.0	44	6.0	46	9.4	45	5.6	25	4.4	17	3.2
B. Argentina.....	8	2.3	37	5.0	37	7.6	38	4.8	14	2.5	15	2.9
C. Chile.....	10	2.9	33	4.5	38	7.7	33	4.1	14	2.5	14	2.7
D. Mexico.....	16	4.4	50	6.8	34	6.9	53	6.7	22	3.9	10	1.9
E. Uruguay.....	4	1.1	19	2.6	21	4.3	14	1.8	10	1.8	8	1.5
F. Peru.....	5	1.5	34	4.6	23	4.7	20	2.6	12	2.2	6	1.1
G. Paraguay.....	3	.9	21	2.9	11	2.2	17	2.1	7	1.2	7	1.3
H. Bolivia.....	4	1.1	29	3.9	12	2.5	14	1.8	9	1.6	6	1.1
I. Ecuador.....	3	.9	26	3.5	9	1.8	13	1.6	9	1.6	5	1.0
J. Columbia.....	5	1.5	33	4.5	10	2.0	23	2.9	9	1.6	3	.6
K. Venezuela.....	5	1.5	31	4.2	15	3.1	14	1.8	8	1.4	7	1.3
L. Central America and Panama...	7	2.0	37	5.0	31	6.3	36	4.5	26	4.6	16	3.1
M. Haiti and Sto. Domingo.....	4	1.1	14	1.9	18	3.7	34	4.2	13	2.3	5	1.0
N. Cuba and Puerto Rico.....	4	1.1	12	1.6	23	4.7	34	4.2	12	2.2	3	.6

TABLE 1 (Continued)
**A COMPARATIVE TOPICAL ANALYSIS OF THE COLLEGE TESTS ON HISPANIC
 AMERICAN HISTORY**

	Sweet		Robertson		James and Martin		Williams		Wilgus		Rippy	
	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent	Pages	Percent
IV. Modern His. American Civilization.....	60	17.1	15	2.0	No separate	47	5.9	11	2.0	33	6.3	
A. Social Conditions.....	22	6.3	3	.4	sections	Two	5	.9	19	3.6		
B. Economic Conditions.....	18	5.1	4	.5	which	chapters	3	.55	11	2.1		
C. Forms of Government.....	20	5.7	8	1.1	might be classified under this heading	discussing modern social evolution, literature, and art.	3	.55	3	.6		
V. International Relationships.....	27	7.7	48	6.5	47	9.6	20	2.5	121	21.5	175	33.5
A. Inter-Hispanic America.....	11	1.5	22	3.9	16	3.1
B. United States and His. America.....	11	3.1	18	2.4	21	4.3	16	2.0	56	10.0	38	7.3
C. Pan Americanism.....	3	.9	7	1.0	8	1.6	4	.5	21	3.7	19	3.6
D. Europe and Hispanic America ..	13	3.7	12	1.6	18	3.7	22	3.9	102	19.5
a. England.....	30	5.7
b. France.....	16	3.1
c. Germany.....	25	4.9
d. Spain.....	18	3.4
Totals.....	350	100.0	737	100.0	490	100.0	789	100.0	562	100.0	523	100.0

TABLE 2
OTHER COMPARATIVE DATA

	Sweet	Robertson	James and Martin	Williams	Wilgus	Rippy
(1) Pages of Written Material in Vol. Proper.....	350	737	490	789	562	523
(2) Words per Page (approximate).....	351	328	355	340	347	365
(3) Total Words (approximate).....	123,000	242,000	174,000	268,000	195,000	191,000
(4) Pages of References.....	12	38	24	22	102	13
(5) Pages of Appendices.....	6	9	47	...
(6) Pages in Index.....	14	21	11	25	33	26
(7) Total Pages (excluding pages of maps).....	382	805	525	836	744	562
(8) Number of Maps.....	10	25	4	19	17	15

TABLE 3
NATURE OF APPENDICES

	PAGES
I. <i>In Sweet.</i>	
(1) A pronouncing glossary of Spanish names	6
II. <i>In Robertson.</i>	
(1) Tables showing tendencies in the Commercial Relations of the Latin American Nations with other states	9
III. <i>In Wilgus.</i>	
(1) Inter Hispanic American Boundary Disputes, Claims, and Arbitrations	4
(2) Hispanic American and European Claims and Arbitrations	3
(3) Some Syllabi of Hispanic-American History	1
(4) Bibliographies in English Dealing with Hispanic America	5
(5) Index Guide to Hispanic-American History Maps	34

47

There are no appendices in the other volumes.

STETSON CONN.

The George Washington University.

**LIST OF ARTICLES RELATING TO HISPANIC AMERICA
PUBLISHED IN THE PERIODICALS OF THE AMERICAN
GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY, 1852-1933 INCLUSIVE**

This is the second bibliographical list of a periodical which contains articles of value for the student of Hispanic American history.¹ Like the first this was compiled under the auspices of the Inter-American Bibliographical Association. The material here listed is arranged according to the following outline:

- I. Northern Hispanic America
 - A. General
 - B. Southwestern United States and related history and archaeology.
 - C. Mexico
 - D. Central America
 - 1. General
 - 2. Guatemala
 - 3. Honduras
 - 4. Nicaragua
 - 5. Salvador
 - 6. Panama
 - E. West Indies
 - 1. General
 - 2. Cuba
 - 3. Santo Domingo and Haiti
 - 4. Porto Rico
- II. Southern Hispanic America
 - A. General
 - B. Argentina
 - C. Bolivia
 - D. Brazil
 - E. Chile
 - F. Colombia
 - G. Ecuador
 - H. Paraguay
 - I. Peru
 - J. Venezuela

¹ The first was entitled "Index of articles relating to Hispanic America published in the National Geographic Magazine, volumes I. to LXI. inclusive (1888-1932)". It appeared in the November, 1932, *HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, pp. 493-502.

III. Hispanic America as a whole

IV. Miscellaneous

In the earlier volumes of this society's publications some confusion exists concerning numbering and titles of issues. Volumes 1 and 2 are labeled *Bulletin of the American Geographical and Statistical Society* and were published for the years 1852 to 1856. These two volumes are followed by a volume marked Number II. which bears the title *Journal of the American Geographic and Statistical Society* and covers the years 1860 to 1870. Volumes labeled numbers III. to IX. were published under the title *Journal of the American Geographical Society of New York* and were issued as documents of the State of New York for the years 1872 to 1877. At this point there was issued an extra volume without a number which bears the title *American Geographical Society of New York (1873-1876)* and which contains addresses, most of them having appeared in the previous volumes of the *Journal*. Beginning with volume IV. above, the name *Bulletin* was given to each separate number which comprises a yearly volume. Yet all of the individual numbers issued in a single year and bound together into a single volume comprised the *Journal*. This method continued through volume XXXII. Volumes XXXIII. to XLVII. inclusive are labeled *Bulletin of the American Geographical Society* and continue through the year 1915. Since the beginning of 1916 the periodical has been called the *Geographical Review* and the numbering of the volumes was begun anew. Thus the volume for 1916 is volume I. and the volume for 1933 is volume XXIII. At present, four numbers are issued to the year, but in earlier volumes of the series numbers have varied from one to twelve for the year.

In the following list, references from the *Geographical Review* are indicated by the letters "GR" while all other references are from the earlier series. In this connection it should be noted that the items listed are extended articles and that all so-called brief "notes" are omitted. Likewise, articles dealing with European colonies in America are omitted. All references under each heading are arranged alphabetically by authors, or if anonymous, by title. In many cases the articles are illustrated and often they contain maps.

I. NORTHERN HISPANIC AMERICA

A. GENERAL

1. Babcock, W. H. Markland, otherwise Newfoundland. [Pre-Columbian relations of Norsemen.] GR. IV., No. 4 (October, 1917), 309-315.
2. ——— Recent history and present status of the Vinland problem. [Problem of Norsemen's Expedition of 1003-1006.] GR. X., No. 2 (April, 1921), 265-282.
3. De Costa, B. F. The Northmen in America. II. (1870), 40-54.
4. Dieserud, Juul. Norse discoveries in America. XXXIII., No. 1 (1901), 1-18.
5. Hermannsson, Halldór. The Wineland voyages. A few suggestions. GR. XVII., No. 1 (January, 1927), 107-114.
6. Horsford, E. N. John Cabot's landfall. Site of Norumbega. XVII., No. 2 (1885), 45-78.
7. Ingersoll, Ernest. How the settlement of North America has affected its wild animals. XVII., No. 1 (1885), 17-44.
8. Jefferson, Mark. The anthropography of North America. XLV., No. 3 (1913), 161-180.
9. Le Messurier, H. W. The early relations between Newfoundland and the Channel Islands. [Early fishing before and after Columbus.] GR. II., No. 6 (December, 1916), 449-457.
10. Packard, A. S. Who first saw the Labrador coast? XX., No. 2 (1888), 197-207.
11. Smith, Charles Sprague. The Vinland voyages. XXIV., No. 4 (1892), 510-535.
12. Thornthwaite, C. Warren. The climates of North America according to a new classification. GR. XXI., No. 4 (October, 1931), 633-655.

B. SOUTHWESTERN UNITED STATES AND RELATED HISTORY AND ARCHEOLOGY

13. Atwood, Wallace W. A geographical study of the Mesa Verde. XLIV., No. 8 (1912), 593-598.
14. Birdsall, W. R. The cliff dwellings of the Cañons of the Mesa Verde. XXIII., No. 4 (1891), 584-620.
15. Colton, Harold S. Sunset Crater. The effect of a volcanic eruption on an ancient pueblo people. GR. XXII., No. 4 (1932), 582-590.
16. Dellenbaugh, F. S. The true route of Coronado's march. XXIX., No. 4 (1897), 399-431.
17. Duff, W. Francis. The prehistoric ruins of the Rio Tularosa [New Mexico]. XXIX., No. 3 (1897), 261-270.
18. English, Thomas H. The Cahokia Indian mounds: a plea for their preservation. GR. XI., No. 2 (April, 1921), 207-211.
19. Fewkes, J. Walter. The ruined pueblo in New Mexico discovered by Vargas in 1692. XXXIV., No. 3 (1902), 217-222.
20. Foscue, E. J. Irrigation in the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. GR. XXIII., No. 3 (July, 1933), 457-463.
21. Gregory, Herbert E. The Navajo country. XLVII., No. 8 (1915), 561-577; No. 9, 652-672.

22. Hoover, J. W. Navajo nomadism. GR. XXI., No. 3 (July, 1931), 429-445.
23. Ingersoll, Ernest. Village Indians of New Mexico. VII. (1875), 114-126.
24. Macdougall, D. T. Across Papagueria [in Arizona and North Western Mexico]. XL., No. 12 (1908), 705-725.
25. Mindeleff, Cosmos. Aboriginal architecture in the United States. XXX., No. 5 (1898), 414-427.
26. ———— Origin of the cliff dwellers. XXX., No. 2 (1898), 111-123.
27. Potter, Samuel O. L. Chichilticalli [in Arizona; named by Coronado]. XL., No. 5 (1908), 257-276.
28. Powell, J. W. A discourse in the philosophy of the North American Indians. VIII., (1876), 251-268.
29. Robertson, D. A. The prehistoric inhabitants of the Mississippi valley. V. (1874), 256-272.
30. Simpson, James H. The ruins to be found in New Mexico, and the exploration of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado in search of the seven cities of Cibola. V., (1874), 194-216.
31. Smith, Harlan I. An unknown field in American archaeology [in west and southwestern United States]. XLII., No. 7 (1910), 511-521.
32. Stevenson, James. Ancient habitations of the Southwest. XVIII., No. 4 (1886), 329-342.
33. Waterman, T. T. North American Indian dwellings. GR. XIV., No. 1 (January, 1924), 1-25.

C. MEXICO

34. Cole, Leon J. The caverns and people of Northern Yucatan. XLII., No. 5 (1910), 321-336.
35. Conkling, Alfred R. Mexico: her physical geography and resources. XV., No. 5 (1883), 319-348.
36. Cosby, Stanley W. Notes on a map of the Laguna Salada Basin, Baja California, Mexico. GR. XIX., No. 4 (October, 1929), 613-620.
37. Cushing, Sumner W. The distribution of population in Mexico. GR. XI., No. 2 (April, 1921), 227-242.
38. Eisen, Gustav. Cerros or Cedros Island [off Lower California in the Pacific]. XXXIII., No. 1 (1901), 64-66.
39. ———— Explorations in the cape region of Baja California. Made under the auspices of the California Academy of Sciences. XXIX., No. 3 (1897), 271-280.
40. ———— Explorations in the central part of Baja California. XXXII., No. 5 (1900), 397-429.
41. Emory, William H. Boundary between the United States and Mexico. I. (1854), 32-44.
42. The frontier region of Mexico. GR. III., No. 1 (January, 1917), 16-27.
43. Hovey, Edmund Otis. Geographical notes on the western Sierra Madre of Chihuahua, Mexico. XXXVIII., No. 2 (1906), 84-85.
44. ———— The Isthmus of Tehuantepec and the Tehuantepec national railway. XXXIX., No. 2 (1907), 78-91.

45. ——— The western Sierra Madre of the state of Chihuahua, Mexico. XXXVII., No. 9 (1905), 531-543.
46. Huntington, Ellsworth. The peninsula of Yucatan. XLIV., No. 11 (1912), 801-822.
47. ——— The relation of health to social capacity: the example of Mexico. GR. XI., No. 2 (April, 1921), 243-264.
48. ——— The shifting of climatic zones as illustrated in Mexico. XLV., No. 1 (1913), 1-12; No. 2, 107-116.
49. Lumboltz, Carl. The American cave-dwellers. The Tarahumaris of the Sierra Madre. XXVI., No. 3 (1894), 299-325.
50. ——— The Huichol Indians of Mexico. XXXV., No. 1 (1903), 79-93.
51. ——— The languages of Mexico. XXXV., No. 2 (1903), 202-207.
52. ——— Report on explorations in northern Mexico. XXIII., No. 3 (1891), 386-402.
53. Merrill, F. J. H. Maps of Mexico. XXXVIII., No. 5 (1906), 281-287.
54. Niven, William. Omitlán. A prehistoric city in Mexico. XXIX., No. 2 (1897), 217-222.
55. North, Arthur Walbridge. The uncharted sierra of San Pedro Mártir [Lower California]. XXXIX., No. 9 (1907), 544-554.
56. Packard, A. S. Over the Mexican plateau in a diligence. XVIII., No. 3 (1886), 215-250.
57. Pullen, Clarence. The city of Mexico. XX., No. 2 (1888), 153-182.
58. Romero, Matias. Mexico. XXVIII., No. 4 (1896), 327-386.
59. ——— Mexico a Central American State. XXVI., No. 1 (1894), 32-37.
60. Salisbury, Stephen. An account of the statue called Chac-Mool, discovered by Dr. Augustus Le Plongeon. IX. (1877), 142-148.
61. Sanders, E. M. The natural regions of Mexico. GR. XI., No. 2 (April, 1921), 212-226.
62. Saville, Marshall H. The discovery of Yucatan in 1517 by Francisco Hernández de Córdoba. GR. VI., No. 5 (November, 1918), 436-448.
63. Stevens, Simon. The new route of commerce by the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. III. (1873), 300-342.
64. Viele, Egbert L. The east and west boundary line between the United States and Mexico. XIV., No. 5 (1882), 259-284.
65. ——— The frontiers of the United States [Rio Grande, etc.]. XIV., No. 3 (1882), 166-204.
66. Wilson, Herbert M. Topography of Mexico. XXIX., No. 3 (1897), 249-260.

D. CENTRAL AMERICA

1. General

67. Berendt, O. H. Geographical distribution of the ancient Central American civilization. VIII. (1876), 132-145.
68. Gogorza, Anthony de. Problem of interoceanic communication by way of the American isthmus. XXI., No. 4 (1889), 526-529.
69. ——— Problem of Interoceanic communication by way of the American Isthmus. Proposed unique solution, 1866-1888. XX., No. 4 (1888), 502-513.

70. Guatemala-Honduras Boundary. GR. XXIII., No. 2 (April, 1933), 306-309.
71. Johnson, Emory B. Comparison of distances by the Isthmian canal and other routes. XXXV., No. 2 (1903), 163-176.
72. Ricketson, Oliver (Jr.). Astronomical observations in the Maya area. GR, XVIII., No. 2 (April, 1928), 215-225.
73. Ricketson, Oliver (Jr.) and Kidder, A. V. An archaeological reconnaissance by air in Central America. GR. XX., No. 2 (April, 1930), 178-206.
74. Romero, M. Mr. Blaine and the boundary question between Mexico and Guatemala. XXIX., No. 3 (1897), 281-330.
75. Stockton, Charles H. The commercial geography of the American inter-oceanic canal. XX., No. 1 (1888), 75-93.

2. Guatemala

76. Eisen, Gustav. The earthquake and volcanic eruption in Guatemala in 1902. XXXV., No. 4 (1903), 325-352.
77. ——— Notes during a journey in Guatemala, March to December, 1902. XXXV., No. 3 (1903), 231-252.
78. The Guatemala earthquake of December 1917 and January 1918. GR, V., No. 6 (June, 1918), 459-469.
79. Settlement of the Mexico-Guatemala boundary question, 1882. XXIX., No. 2 (1897), 123-159.

3. Honduras

80. Bengston, Nels A. Notes on the physiography of Honduras. GR. XVI., No. 3 (July, 1926), 403-413.
81. Gordon, George Byron. The ruined city of Copán. XXXI., No. 1 (1899), 39-50.
82. Perry, E. W. Honduras. XXV., No. 2 (1893), 224-235.
83. Sinclair, Joseph H. Notes on the mapping of an area in Southern Honduras. GR. XIV., No. 2 (April, 1924), 275-281.
84. Squier, Ephraim George. Some account of the Lake Yojoa or Taulebé, in Honduras, Central America. II. (1860), 19-24.

4. Nicaragua

85. Ammen, Daniel. Interoceanic ship canal across the American Isthmus. X. (1878), 142-162.
86. ——— The proposed interoceanic ship canal across Nicaragua. [Also appendix and discussion to this article, p. 152-300.] XI., No. 4 (1879), 113-152.
87. Discussion upon a proposed interoceanic canal through Nicaragua. VIII. (1876), 210-213.
88. Farrington, William D. The language of the Mosquito Shore. XXIV., No. 4 (1892), 559-564.
89. Horter, John C. Cultivated rubber. XXXVII., No. 12 (1903), 720-724.
90. Kalb, Courtenay de. A bibliography of the Mosquito Coast of Nicaragua. XXVI., No. 2 (1894), 241-248.

91. ——— Nicaragua: studies on the Mosquito Shore in 1892. XXV., No. 2 (1893), 236-288.
92. Peary, R. E. The Rio San Juan de Nicaragua. XXI., No. 1 (1889), 57-86.
93. Taylor, H. C. The Nicaragua Canal. XVIII., No. 2 (1886), 97-126.

5. *Salvador*

94. Littlehales, G. W. The recent survey of Jiquilisco Bay and El Triunfo, the new port of Salvador. XXIX., No. 4 (1897), 393-398.

6. *Panama*

95. Ammen, Daniel. Surveys and reconnaissances from 1870 to 1875 for a ship canal across the American Isthmus. VIII. (1876), 188-203.
96. Barbour, T. and Brooks, W. S. The Sapo mountains and the Sambá valley. A biological reconnaissance in southeastern Panama. GR. XIII., No. 2 (April, 1923), 211-222.
97. Bigelow, Poultney. An American Panama. Some personal notes on tropical colonization as affected by geographic and political conditions. XXXVIII., No. 8 (1906), 489-494.
98. Brown, Robert M. Five years of the Panama Canal: an evolution. GR. IX., No. 3 (March, 1920), 191-198.
99. Collins, Frederick. Explorations and surveys for a ship canal across the Isthmus of Darien. VII. (1875), 367-377.
100. ——— The Isthmus of Darien and the valley of the Atrato considered with reference to the practicability of an interoceanic ship-canal. V. (1874), 138-165.
101. Davis, Arthur P. The Isthmian canal XXXIV., No. 2 (1902), 132-138.
102. Herbert, John W. The Panama Canal: its construction and its effect on commerce. XLV., No. 4 (1913), 241-254.
103. Johnson, Emory R. The Panama canal in its commercial aspects. XXXV., No. 5 (1903), 481-491.
104. Morison, George S. The Panama Canal. XXXV., No. 1 (1903), 24-43.
105. Nicholas, Francis Child. Notes of some dangerous rocks off the Gulf of Darien. XXIX., No. 2 (1897), 193-194.
106. Verner, S. P. The San Blas Indians of Panama. GR. X., No. 1 (July, 1920), 23-30.
107. Watts, Geog. B. Interoceanic communications across the Isthmus of Panama, or Darien. I. (1854), 62-80.

E. WEST INDIES

1. *General*

108. Alexander, W. H. Notes on the flora of the West Indies, with special reference to the Island of St. Kitts. XXXIV., No. 3 (1902), 223-231.
109. Babcock, Wm. H. Antillia and the Antilles. GR. IX., No. 2 (February, 1920), 109-124.
110. ——— Atlantis and Antillia. GR. III., No. 5 (May, 1917), 292-295.

111. Fewkes, J. Walter. Relations of aboriginal culture and environment in the Lesser Antilles. XLVI., No. 9 (1914), 662-678.
112. Hubbard, Lucius L. Did Columbus discover the Islands of Antigua and St. Martin? GR. XXI., No. 4 (October, 1931), 584-597.
113. Ober, F. A. Florida and the West Indies. XVIII., No. 3 (1886), 183-214.
114. Platt, Raye R. A note on political sovereignty and administration in the Caribbean. GR. XVI., No. 4 (October, 1926), 623-637.
115. Scisco, L. D. The track of Ponce de León in 1513. XLV., No. 10 (1913), 721-735.
116. Stewart, Glenn. San Salvador Island to Cuba. A cruise in the track of Columbus. GR. XXI., No. 1 (January, 1931), 124-130.
117. Wilson, James Grant. Memorials and footprints of Columbus. XVI., No. 2 (1884), 160-185.

2. Cuba

118. Bennett, Hugh Hammond. Some geographic aspects of Cuban soils. GR. XVIII., No. 1 (January, 1928), 62-82.
119. Fernow, B. E. The High Sierra Maestra. XXXIX., No. 5 (1907), 257-268.
120. Gannett, Henry. The results of the Cuban census. XXXII., No. 3 (1900), 281-286.
121. Platt, Robert S. Geography of a sugar district: Mariel, Cuba. GR. XIX., No. 4 (October, 1929), 603-612.
122. Vaughan, T. Wayland and Arthur C. Spencer. The geography of Cuba. XXXIV., No. 2 (1902), 105-116.
123. Whitbeck, B. H. Geographical relations in the development of Cuban agriculture. GR. XII., No. 2 (April, 1922), 223-240.
124. Whittlesey, D. S. Geographic factors in the relations of the United States and Cuba. GR. XII., No. 2 (April, 1922), 241-256.

3. Santo Domingo and Haiti

125. Appelton, Nathan. Santo Domingo City. XXIII., No. 4 (1891), 533-565.
126. Durland, William Davies. The forests of the Dominican Republic. GR. XII., No. 2 (April, 1922), 206-222.
127. Fairchild, Fred Rogers. The problems of Santo Domingo. GR. X., No. 9 [sic: i.e. No. 3] (September, 1920), 121-138.

4. Porto Rico

128. Alexander, William A. Porto Rico, its climate and resources. XXXIV., No. 5 (1902), 401-409.
129. Gannett, Henry. The census of Porto Rico. XXXII., No. 4 (1900), 328-330.
130. Hoeselbarth, A. C. Culebra Island. XXXV., No. 2 (1903), 125-130.
131. Overcrowded Porto Rico. GR. I., No. 3 (March, 1916), 211-212.
132. Wilson, Herbert M. Porto Rico: Its topography and aspects. XXXII., No. 3 (1900), 220-238.

II. SOUTHERN HISPANIC AMERICA

A. General

133. Bandelier, A. F. The basin of Lake Titicaca. XXXVII., No. 8 (1905), 449-460.
134. Cochrane, H. C. The Misti, and travels in Peru and Chile. VI. (1874), 212-226.
135. Douglas, James, Jr. Journey along the West Coast of South America, from Panama to Valparaiso. X. (1878), 197-225.
136. Gregory, Hubert E. A geographical sketch of Titicaca, the island of the sun. XLV., No. 7 (1913), 561-575.
137. Hanson, Earl. Social regression in the Orinoco and Amazon basins. Notes on a journey in 1931 and 1932. GR. XXIII., No. 4 (October, 1933), 578-598.
138. Hardy, Osgood. South American alliances: some political and geographical considerations. GR. VIII., Nos. 4-5 (October-November, 1919), 259-265.
139. Jefferson, Mark. Actual temperatures of South America. GR. XVI., No. 3 (July, 1926), 443-466.
140. Kalb, Courtenay de. The society and political development of the South American people. XXVI., No. 1 (1894), 1-31.
141. McBride, George McCutcheon. Cotton growing in South America. GR. IX., No. 1 (January, 1920), 35-50.
142. Morong, Thomas. The Rio de la Plata—Its basin, geography and inhabitants. XXIV., No. 4 (1892), 479-509.
143. Murphy, Robert Cushman. Oceanic and climatic phenomena along the west coast of South America during 1925. GR. XVI., No. 1 (January, 1926), 26-54.
144. Platt, Raye R. Present status of international boundaries in South America. GR. XIV., No. 4 (October, 1924), 622-638.
145. Smith, E. Reued. Tierra del fuego and the Sahara. XX., No. 2 (1888), 231-234.
146. Tower, Walter S. Notes on the commercial geography of South America. XLV., No. 12 (1913), 881-901.
147. Troll, Karl. An expedition to the Central Andes, 1926 to 1928. GR. XIX., No. 2 (April, 1929), 234-247.
148. Ward, Robert De C. The climate of South America. XXXV., No. 4 (1903), 353-360.
149. Wrigley, G. M. Fairs of the Central Andes. GR. VII., No. 2 (February, 1919), 65.
150. Zon, Raphael. South American timber resources and their relation to the World's timber supply. GR. II., No. 4 (October, 1916), 256-266.

B. Argentina

151. Bowman, Isaiah. Northern Patagonia, a résumé of Mr. Bailey Willis' surveys along the 41st parallel. XLVII., No. 5 (1915), 348-357.
152. Corthell, Elmer L. Two years in Argentina as the consulting engineer of national public works. XXXV., No. 5 (1903), 439-471.

153. Durland, William D. The Quebracho region of Argentina. GR. XIV., No. 2 (April, 1924), 227-241.
154. Furlong, Charles Wellington. Some effects of environment on the Fuegian tribes. GR. III., No. 1 (January, 1917), 1-15.
155. ——— Tribal distribution and settlements of the Fuegians. Comprising nomenclature, etymology, philology, and population. GR. III., No. 3 (March, 1917), 169-187.
156. Smith, J. Russell. The economic geography of the Argentina Republic. XXXV., No. 2 (1903), 130-143.
157. Tower, Walter S. The Pampa of Argentina. GR. V., No. 4 (April, 1918), 293-315.
158. Wilcox, Marrion. Argentine Patagonia. A land of the future. XLII., No. 12 (1910), 903-909.
159. ——— The territory of Magellan. XLII., No. 11 (1910), 826-831.
160. Willis, Bailey. Argentina and the Argentines. XLVII., No. 9 (1915), 680-684.
161. Wrigley, G. M. Salta. An early commercial center of Argentina. GR. II., No. 2 (August, 1916), 116-133.

C. Bolivia

162. Bingham, Hiram. Potosí. XLIII., No. 1 (1911), 1-13.
163. Bowman, Isaiah. Trade routes in the economic geography of Bolivia. XLII., No. 1 (1910), 22-37; No. 2, 90-104; No. 3, 180-192.
164. Mather, Kirtley F. Along the Andean front in southeastern Bolivia. GR. XII., No. 3 (July, 1922), 358-374.
165. ——— Exploration in the land of the Yuracarés, eastern Bolivia. GR. XII., No. 1 (January, 1922), 42-56.
166. Miller, Leo E. Across the Bolivian Highlands from Cochabamba to the Chaparé. GR. IV., No. 4 (October, 1917), 267-283.
167. ——— The Yuracaré Indians of eastern Bolivia. GR. IV., No. 6 (December, 1917), 450-464.
168. Peck, Annie. The conquest of Huascarán. XLI., No. 6 (1909), 335-364.
169. Rivière, H. Arnous de. Explorations in the Beni provinces. XXIV., No. 2 (1893), 204-214.
170. ——— Explorations in the rubber districts of Bolivia. XXXII., No. 5 (1900), 432-440.
171. Romecin, Eduardo. Agricultural adaptation in Bolivia. GR. XIX., No. 2 (April, 1929), 248-255.
172. Walcott, Frederic C. An expedition to the Laguna Colorada, southern Bolivia, with a note on the recent occurrence of "El Niño". GR. XV., No. 3 (July, 1925), 345-366.
173. Wrigley, G. M. The traveling doctors of the Andes: The Callahuayas of Bolivia. GR. IV., No. 3 (September, 1917), 183-196.

D. Brasil

174. Bowman, Isaiah. Geographical aspects of the new Madeira-Mamoré railroad. XLV., No. 4 (1913), 275-281.

175. Chamberlain, G. W. The conditions and prospects of Brazil. XXII., No. 4 (1890), 537-554.
176. Col. Roosevelt's exploration of a tributary of the Madeira. XLVI., No. 7 (1914), 512-519.
177. Exploration of the Rio Ananás, Brazil. [Letter from Colonel Theodore Roosevelt.] GR. I., No. 1 (January, 1916), 50.
178. Hartt, Charles Fred. On the geology of Brazil. II. (1870), 55-70.
179. ——— Recent explorations in the valley of the Amazonas, with map. III. (1870-1871), 231-252.
180. Holdridge, Desmond. Exploration between the Rio Branco and the Sierra Parisma. GR. XXIV., No. 3 (July, 1933), 372-384.
181. James, Preston E. The coffee lands of southeastern Brazil. GR. XXII., No. 2 (1932), 225-244.
182. ——— Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. GR. XXIII., No. 2 (April, 1933), 271-298.
183. Jefferson, Mark. An American colony in Brazil. GR. XVIII., No. 2 (April, 1928), 226-231.
184. ——— New rainfall maps of Brazil. GR. XIV., No. 1 (January, 1924), 127-135.
185. ——— Pictures from southern Brazil. GR. XVI., No. 4 (October, 1926), 521-547.
186. Kalb, Courtenay de. The Great Amazon; Personal investigations on the River, and in its upper valley. XXIII., No. 1 (1891), 1-46.
187. Lange, N. A. The rubber workers of the Amazons. XLIII., No. 1 (1911), 33-36.
188. The last exploration of Lt. Marques de Sousa: Diary of a journey on the Ananás River, Brazil. GR. VIII., No. 4-5 (October-November, 1919), 243-258; No. 6 (December), 329-344.
189. Marbut, C. F. and Manifold, C. B. The soils of the Amazon Basin in relation to agricultural possibilities. GR. XVI., No. 3 (July, 1926), 414-442.
190. ——— The topography of the Amazon Valley. GR. XV., No. 4 (October, 1925), 617-642.
191. Miller, Leo E. The descent of the Rio Gy-Paraná. GR. I., No. 3 (March, 1916), 169-191.
192. Nash, Roy. The houses of rural Brazil. GR. XIII., No. 3 (July, 1923), 329-344.
193. Ogden, William Butler. Pará and the Amazons [in 1888]. XXI., No. 4 (1889), 459-493.
194. Report of the Hydrographic commission of Peru on the Amazon River. VII. (1875), 357-365.
195. Schurz, W. L. The distribution of population in the Amazon Valley. GR. XV., No. 2 (April, 1925), 206-225.
196. Shaw, E. W. and Darnell (Jr.), J. L. A frontier region in Brazil. South-western Maranhão. GR. XVI., No. 2 (April, 1926), 177-195.
197. Snethlage, Emilie. Nature and man in eastern Pará, Brazil. GR. IV., No. 1 (July, 1917), 41-50.

198. Ward, Robert DeC. The economic climatology of the coffee district of São Paulo, Brazil. XLIII, No. 6 (1911), 428-445.
199. ——— The southern campos of Brazil. XL, No. 11 (1908), 652-662.

E. Chile

200. Bowman, Isaiah. Regional population groups of Atacama. XLI., No. 3 (1909), 142-154; No. 4, 193-211.
201. Browne, (Jr.) Albert G. The growing power of the Republic of Chile. XVI., No. 1 (1884), 3-88.
202. Douglas, James. Chile—Its geography, people and institutions. XIII., No. 2 (1881), 59-92.
203. Hanson, Earl. Out-of-the-world villages of Atacama. GR. XVI., No. 3 (July, 1926), 365-377.
204. McBride, George McCutchen. The agrarian problem of Chile. GR. XX., No. 4 (October, 1930), 574-586.
205. Riso Patrón, Luis. The altitude of Aconcagua. GR. XVIII., No. 3 (July, 1928), 485-488.
206. Rudolph, Wm. E. The new territorial divisions of Chile with special reference to Chiloé. GR. XIX., No. 1 (January, 1929), 61-77.
207. ——— The Rio Loa of northern Chile. GR. XVII., No. 4 (October, 1927), 553-585.
208. Skottsberg, Carl. The Islands of Juan Fernández. GR. V., No. 5 (May, 1918), 362-383.
209. Smith, J. Russell. The economic geography of Chile. XXXVI., No. 1 (1904), 1-21.

F. Colombia

210. Adams, Charles C. The zoögeography of northwesternmost South America (after Chapman). GR. X., No. 2 (August, 1920), 101-107.
211. Bennett, J. A. My first trip up the Magdalena and life in the heart of the Andes. IX. (1877), 126-141.
212. Martin, F. O. Explorations in Colombia. GR. XIX., No. 4 (October, 1929), 621-637.
213. Notestein, Frank B. and Robert E. King. The Sierra Nevada de Cocuy. GR. XXII., No. 3 (1932), 423-430.
214. Platt, Raye R. Railroad progress in Colombia. GR. XVI., No. 1 (January, 1926), 82-97.
215. Taylor, Griffith. Settlement zones of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Colombia. GR. XXI., No. 4 (October, 1931), 539-558.

G. Ecuador

216. Bennett, F. W. Guayaquil and Quito Railway. XXXV., No. 4 (1903), 361-364.
217. Hermessen, J. L. A journey on the Rio Zamora, Ecuador. GR. IV., No. 6 (December, 1917), 434-449.
218. Larrea, Carlos M. Geographical notes on Esmeraldas, northwestern Ecuador. GR. XIV., No. 3 (July, 1924), 373-387.

219. Littlehales, G. W. The Recent scientific mission for the measurement of arcs of the meridian in Spitzbergen and Ecuador. XXXIX., No. 11 (1907), 641-653.
220. Sheppard, George. Notes on the climate and physiography of southwestern Ecuador. GR. XX., No. 3 (July, 1930), 445-453.
221. ——— The rainy season of 1933 in southwestern Ecuador. GR. XXIII., No. 2 (April, 1933), 210-216.
222. ——— The Salt Industry in Ecuador. GR. XXII., No. 3 (1932), 403-410.
223. Sinclair, Joseph H. In the land of Cinnamon: a journey in Eastern Ecuador. GR. XIX., No. 2 (April, 1929), 201-217.
224. Sinclair, Joseph H. and Wasson, Theron. Explorations in eastern Ecuador. GR. XIII., No. 2 (April, 1923), 190-210.

H. Paraguay

225. Hopkins, Edward A. Memoir of the geography, history, productions and trade of Paraguay. I. (1852), 14-46.

I. Peru

226. Bingham, Hiram. Preliminary report of the Yale Peruvian expedition. XLIV., No. 1 (1912), 20-26.
227. Bowman, Isaiah. The Cañon of the Urubamba. XLIV., No. 12 (1912), 881-897.
228. ——— The country of the Shepherds—[a chapter from the author's book *The Andes of Southern Peru*]. GR. I., No. 6 (June, 1916), 419-442.
229. ——— Results of an expedition to the central Andes. XLVI., No. 3 (1914), 161-183.
230. Coker, R. E. Ocean temperatures off the coast of Peru. GR. V., No. 2 (February, 1918), 127-135.
231. Hardy, Osgood. Cuzco and Apurimac. A report of the commercial and industrial outlook of south central Peru. XLVI., No. 7 (1914), 500-512.
232. Holstein, Otto. Chan-Chan: capital of the Great Chimú. GR. XVII., No. 1 (January, 1927), 36-61.
233. Irrigation projects in Peru. GR. XVII., No. 3 (July, 1927), 487-490.
234. Means, Philip Ainsworth. A note on the Guarani invasions of the Inca Empire. GR. IV., No. 6 (December, 1917), 482-484.
235. Miller, O. M. Note on the map of the Huallaga gorge between Huanuco and Mufía. GR. XIX., No. 2 (April, 1929), 293-295.
236. ——— The 1927-1928 Peruvian Expedition of the American Geographical Society. GR. XIX., No. 1 (January, 1929), 1-37.
237. Murphy, Robert Cushman. The oceanography of the Peruvian littoral with reference to the abundance and distribution of marine life. GR. XIII., No. 1 (January, 1923), 64-85.
238. Nordenskiöld, Baron Erland. The Guarani invasion of the Inca empire in the 16th Century: an historical Indian migration. GR. IV., No. 2 (August, 1917), 103-121.
239. Platt, Robert S. Six farms on the Central Andes. GR. XXII., No. 2 (1932), 245-259.

240. Professor Bowman's expedition to the Central Andes. XLV., No. 5 (1913), 348-351.
241. Sears, Alfred F. The coastal desert of Peru. XXVII., No. 3 (1895), 256-271.
242. Shippee, Robert. The "Great Wall of Peru" and other aerial photographic studies by the Shippee-Johnson Peruvian expedition. GR. XXII., No. 1 (1932), 1-29.
234. ——— Lost valleys of Peru. Results of the Shippee-Johnson Peruvian expedition. GR. XXII., No. 4 (1932), 562-581.
244. Shumacher, John. Explorations among the ruins of Pachacamác, Peru. V. (1874), 248-255.
245. Squier, E. G. Observations on the geography and archeology of Peru. III. (1870-1871), 253-282.
246. A survey of Peruvian commerce. GR. XVI., No. 3 (July, 1926), 493-499.

J. Venezuela

247. Anthony, H. E., Gleason, H. A., Platt, R. R. The Pacaraima-Venezuela Expedition. GR. XXI., No. 3 (July, 1931), 353-362.
248. Booy, Theodoor de. An exploration of the Sierra de Perijá, Venezuela. GR. VI., No. 5 (November, 1918), 385-410.
249. ——— The western Maracaibo lowland, Venezuela. GR. VI., No. 6 (December, 1918), 481-500.
250. Chapman, Frank M. Problems of the Roraima-Duida Region as presented by the bird life. GR. XXI., No. 3 (July, 1931), 363-372.
251. Crist, Raymond E. Along the Llanos-Andes border in Zamora, Venezuela. GR. XXII., No. 3 (1932), 411-422.
252. Holdridge, Desmond. Notes on an exploratory journey in southeastern Venezuela. GR. XXI., No. 3 (July, 1931), 373-378.
253. Lefferts, Walter. The cattle industry of the Llanos. XLV., No. 3 (1913), 180-187.
254. Miller, Leo E. The Land of the Maquiritares. GR. III., No. 5 (May, 1917), 356-374.
255. ——— Up the Orinoco to the land of the Maquiritares. GR. III., No. 4 (April, 1917), 258-277.
256. Rice, A. Hamilton. Plans for exploration at the headwaters of the Branco and Orinoco. GR. XV., No. 1 (January, 1925), 115-122.
257. Tate, G. H. H. Notes on the Mount Roraima region. GR. XX., No. 1 (January, 1930), 53-68.
258. Tate, G. H. H. and Hitchcock, C. B. The Cerro Duida region of Venezuela. GR. XX., No. 1 (January, 1930), 31-52.
259. Willcox, H. Case. An exploration of the Rio de Oro, Columbia-Venezuela. GR. XI., No. 3 (July, 1921), 372-383.

III. HISPANIC AMERICA AS A WHOLE

260. The Earliest known printed map showing America. [Contarini map.] GR. XIV., No. 2 (April, 1924), 318-319.

261. Hubbard, George D. The influence of the precious metals on American exploration, discovery, conquest and possession. XLII., No. 8 (1910), 594-602.
262. Hurlbut, George C. The origin of the name "America". XVIII., No. 4 (1886), 301-316.
263. ——— The origin of the name "America". XX., No. 2 (1888), 183-196.
264. Jefferson, Mark. Population estimates for the countries of the world from 1914 to 1920. [Includes Hispanic America.] XLVI., No. 6 (1914), 401-413.
265. ——— The real temperatures throughout North and South America. GR. VI., No. 3 (September, 1918), 240-267.
266. Karpinski, Louis C. The first map with the name America. GR. XX., No. 4 (October, 1930), 664-668.
267. Lambert, T. H. The origin of the name of America from the national history of the Peruvians. XV., No. 1 (1883), 45-72.
268. Millionth map of Hispanic America. GR. XIV., No. 1 (January, 1924), 136-137.
269. Ober, Frederick A. Ancient cities of America. XX., No. 1 (1888), 39-74.
270. The Pan-American Railway. XXXVI., No. 8 (1904), 466-470.
271. Parry, Francis. The Sacred symbols and numbers of aboriginal America in ancient and modern times. XXVI., No. 2 (1894), 163-207.
272. Platt, Raye R. The Millionth Map of Hispanic America. GR. XVII., No. 2 (April, 1927), 301-308.
273. ——— Catalog of maps of Hispanic America. GR. XXIII., No. 4 (October, 1933), 660-663.
274. ——— Surveys in Hispanic America. Notes on a new map showing the extent and character of surveys in Hispanic America. GR. XX., No. 1 (January, 1930), 138-142.
275. Spanish Emigration [1911-1915, to Hispanic America and elsewhere]. GR. XII., No. 2 (April, 1922), 309-310.
276. Spinden, H. J. The population of Ancient America. GR. XVIII., No. 4 (October, 1928), 641-660.
277. Stevenson, E. L. Typical early maps of the New World. XXXIX., No. 4 (1907), 202-224.
278. Willcox, H. Casa. Air transportation in Latin America. GR. XX., No. 4 (October, 1930), 587-604.
279. Wissler, Clark. The culture of the American Indian: Its regional distribution and origin. GR. X., No. 4 (October, 1920), 262-266.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

280. Atlantis, the "Lost" Continent. A Review of Termier's evidence. GR. III., No. 1 (January, 1917), 61-66.
281. Babcock, William H. The Island of the Seven Cities. GR. VII., No. 2 (February, 1919), 98-106.
282. ——— The Problem of Maydia, an Island appearing on Medieval Maps. GR. IX., No. 4 (April-June, 1920), 335-346.

283. ——— St. Brendan's explorations and Islands. *Gk.* VIII., No. 1 (July, 1919), 37-46.
284. Balch, Edwin Swift. Atlantis or Minoan Crete. *GR.* III., No. 5 (May, 1917), 388-392.
285. Benedict, Robert D. The Hereford Map and the legend of St. Brandon. *XXIV.*, No. 3 (1892), 321-365.
286. Brevoort, James Carson. Notes on Giovanni da Verrazano and on a planisphere of 1529, illustrating his American voyage in 1524, with a reduced copy of the map. *IV.* (1872), 145-297.
287. Champlin, John Denison. The discoverer of the Philippines [Magellan]. *XLIII.*, No. 8 (1911), 587-597.
288. Cordeiro, F. J. B. Tropical Hurricanes. *XXXII.*, No. 3 (1900), 249-259.
289. Daly, Charles P. Have we a portrait of Columbus? *XXV.*, No. 1 (1893), 1-63.
290. ——— On the early history of Cartography, or what we know of maps and map-making, before the time of Mercator. *XI.*, No. 1 (1879), 1-37.
291. Hague, James D. The Drake medal [about Drake's voyage around world]. *XL.*, No. 8 (1908), 449-469.
292. Hall, Elial F. Americus Vespucius. *XXIV.*, No. 3 (1892), 366-378.
293. Hurlbut, George C. The Falkland Islands. *XIX.*, No. 3 (1887), 254-260.
294. Jefferson, Mark. The steady warmth of the Tropics. *XLVII.*, No. 5 (1915), 346-348.
295. Jones, Clarence F. The Economic activities of the Falkland Islands. *GR.* XIV., No. 3 (July, 1924), 394-403.
296. Kohle, Paul. A lost map of Columbus. *GR.* XXIV., No. 4 (October, 1933), 621-638.
297. Kemble, George H. Portuguese policy and its influence on 15th century cartography. *GR.* XXIII., No. 4 (October, 1933), 653-659.
298. Knapp, Philip Coombs. Crete and Atlantis. *GR.* VIII., No. 2 (August, 1919), 126-129.
299. Maury, Mytton. On Martin Behaim's globe, and his influence upon geographical science. *IV.* (1872), 432-452.
300. McBride, George McCutcheon. The Galapagos Islands. *GR.* VI., No. 3 (September, 1918), 229-239.
301. Medieval science and the tropics. *XLV.*, No. 6 (1913), 435-438.
302. Nicholas, Francis C. Economic importance of geological and physical conditions in tropical America. *XXIX.*, No. 1 (1897), 55-60.
303. Nordenskiöld, A. E. A remarkable Globe Map of the 16th century. *XVI.*, No. 3 (1884), 222-233.
304. Pepper, George H. The Museum of the American Indian, Haye Foundation. [Tells of archaeological expeditions and collections.] *GR.* II., No. 6 (December, 1916), 401-418.
305. Robertson, C. J. Geographical trends in sugar production. *GR.* XXII., No. 1 (1932), 120-130.
306. Schuller, Rudolph. The date of Oviedo's map of the Maracaibo region. *GR.* III., No. 4 (April, 1917), 294-302.

307. Smith, J. Russell. The economic importance of the plateaus in Tropic America. XXXVII., No. 8 (1905), 461-468.
308. ——— The Economic importance of the Plateaus in Tropic America. XLIII., No. 1 (1911), 36-45.
309. Stevenson, E. L. Martin Waldseemüller and the early lusitano-germanic cartography of the New World. XXXVI., No. 4 (1904), 193-215.
310. Sykes, Godfrey. The Isles of California. XLVII., No. 10 (1915), 745-761.
311. ——— The mythical straits of Anian. XLVII., No. 3 (1915), 161-172.
312. Valentini, P. J. J. The Portuguese in the track of Columbus (1493). XX., No. 4 (1884), 432-444; XXI., No. 1, 35-56; XXI., No. 2, 167-196, No. 3, 359-379.
313. Ward, Robert DeC. Some problems of the Tropics. XL., No. 1 (1908), 7-11.

A. CURTIS WILGUS.

The George Washington University.

NOTES

A list of the periodicals and newspapers published in Brazil in 1930 is one of the most important sections of the second volume of the *Estatística intelectual do Brasil* (1929) issued by the Departamento Nacional de Estatística of Brazil in 1932. Even governmental periodicals and annual publications are mentioned in the section of about 100 pages. Foreign language periodicals published in Brazil are also included. The principal arrangement is alphabetical by states, including at the end a few titles for the territory of Acre. For each publication the list gives the title, address, the character (literary, scientific, propaganda, etc.), the periodicity, and the date of establishment. The same volume also includes among other things a list of Brazilian universities and faculties, a list of the libraries in Brazil, 1930 (without statement concerning collections), a list of Brazilian museums, and a list of scientific, literary, and artistic societies in Brazil, 1930. It is to be hoped that this useful publication may be continued, and in the future furnish more details about the societies and institutions, in particular about the publications issued.—J. B. CHILDS.

A new historical review has recently made its debut in Hispanic America. As early as 1921 was organized the Academia Panameña de la Historia but it was not until early in the present year that the first number of the *Boletín* of the Academy made its appearance. Of the three numbers thus far issued that of July (No. 3) calls for special mention. Practically the entire issue is devoted to a remarkable monograph of nearly two hundred pages, written by one of the members of the Academy, Sr. Ernesto J. Castillero R., on the subject of "La Causa inmediata de la Emancipación de Panamá". The importance of the work lies not only in the able résumé of the diplomatic and political steps eventuating in the separation of Panamá from Colombia but above all in the analysis and in many cases the inclusion of significant documents published in Bogotá and Panamá which have been little known and used by previous writers on the subject. No future writer on isthmian Canal diplomacy can afford to

neglect this monograph. The address of the perpetual secretary of the Academy, Sr. Juan Antonio Susto, is Apartado 973, Panamá.—P. A. M.

The Carnegie Institution of Washington published in 1932 the first volume of Waldo G. Leland's *Guide to Materials for American History in the Library and Archives of Paris* (pp. xiii, 343). This is Publication No. 392, Vol. I. The manuscripts listed in this volume exist in thirteen libraries in Paris, and are of a very miscellaneous character. As one might expect, a greater number of the materials are found in the Bibliothèque Nationale than in the other depositories. A considerable number of the manuscripts concern Hispanic America, which one can readily locate by consulting the excellent index. There is also a useful list of maps. This guide is another of the remarkable series of guides planned by Dr. Jameson. Scholars have long awaited its appearance; and it is hoped that the remainder of the work will appear in the near future.

Dr. Santiago Key-Ayala has published through the Tipografía Americana of Caracas (1933) a compilation of articles appearing in periodicals in Venezuela and elsewhere on Bolívar, "El Libertador". The volume is entitled *Serie Hemero-Bibliográficas: Primera Serie Bolivariana*. The list is preceded by an excellent bibliographical essay of twelve pages which its author calls an "Explicación". The list includes 1,000 items (pp. 202); and the volume supplements considerably the Bibliography (see this REVIEW for November, 1933) compiled in the Pan American Union (1933). All title entries are from periodicals and duplicate only to a very limited extent the Pan American Union volume. The compiler has done an immense amount of work in his volume and is to be congratulated for this painstaking labor of love. The student now can have little excuse for not finding materials for a study of Bolívar, for he has in this volume and the other volume noted above an embarrassment of riches.

The Carnegie Institution of Washington has recently published two valuable volumes on American archaeology. The first is *Contribution to American Archaeology*, I., Nos. 1-4 (Washington, November, 1931, pp. 157, plates). This volume contains four items, as follows: "Excavations at Baking Pot, British Honduras", by Oliver Richetson,

Jr. (25 plates and three text figures); "Maya Astronomy", by John E. Temple (19 text figures); "The Temple of the Wall Panels, Chichen Itzá", by Karl Ruppert (18 plates and two text figures); and "Notes on the Metates of Chichen Itzá, Yucatan", by Gustav Strómsvik (six plates and text figures). The first describes the results of excavations in British Honduras. Apparently, there are still many sites to be explored in this region. The second item on Maya astronomy aims to give "such information as we have or can deduce from the Maya inscriptions and the Dresden Codex concerning the numerical system of the ancient Maya and their observational astronomical knowledge". This is a technical and involved discussion and one needs much study to comprehend it fully. One gathers, however, that a great deal of the interpretation is still in the realm of uncertainty. Dr. Ruppert's article on the temple in Chichen Itzá is a faithful description of the excavation of the temple, which appears to be Nahua rather than Maya. The fourth item on the milling stones of Chichen Itzá is most interesting as it shows the relation between the old Mayan use of such stones and the present use.

The second volume is by J. Eric Thompson, Harry E. D. Polloch, and Jean Charlot, and is entitled *A Preliminary Study of the Ruins of Cobá, Quintana Roo, Mexico* (Washington, March, 1932, pp. viii, 213, plates, and map). The introduction, the description of the monuments, and the conclusions are by Mr. Thompson; the description of the ruins and the architecture, by Mr. Polloch; and an analysis of the Macanxoc Stellae, by Mr. Charlot. In his introduction, Mr. Thompson gives in descriptive style information regarding the situation, topography, water supply, rainfall, flora, fauna, present-day population, religious practices, the etymology of Cobá, the approach to the ruins, camp, and facilities. Mr. Pollach's description of the ruins and their architecture is complete. He concludes that "there are apparently two periods of construction represented in the Cobá area". Most of the remains belong to the earlier period, "while the later period is represented by a few buildings distinctly allied to the ruins of the eastern coast of Yucatan". Mr. Thompson gives a detailed description of the various stellæ and other monuments, which is largely technical. With this should be read, perhaps, Mr. Temple's article on the Calendar of the Mayas, noted in the book above. Mr. Charlot's contribution is an analysis of the Macanxoc stellæ, and is

technical. In his "conclusions", Mr. Thompson has something to say of the colonization of Yucatan by the Maya, the relations of Cobá with the east coast and with northwest Yucatan; Cobá's influence at Yaxuná; influence of northwest Yucatan on Cobá. There is an interesting bibliography. The illustrations are printed on special paper and are excellent in their detail. Both volumes are further contributions to American archaeology.

The Peninsula of Yucatan: Medical, Biological, Meteorological, and Sociological Studies, by George Cheevers Shattuck, M.D., assistant professor of tropical medicine in Harvard University Medical School, assisted by thirteen collaborators, was published in 1933 by the Carnegie Institution of Washington in a small folio volume (pp. xvii, 576). In its four parts, consisting of twenty-nine chapters, a great deal of miscellaneous information is given, ranging from description, history, anthropology, government, and natural history to studies on the present Mayan communities, sanitation and medical work, and studies in certain diseases and epidemics. This is an epochal work and should undoubtedly be read by all archaeological workers in Yucatan. The volume is the result of three medical expeditions made to Yucatan in 1929, 1930, and 1931, respectively, all three of which were organized by the department of tropical medicine of Harvard University at the instigation of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, under whose auspices the work was done. The purpose of the expedition of 1929 was to make a preliminary survey of disease in Yucatan, and the objective of the two following expeditions was to supplement work already done. The first two expeditions were under charge of Dr. Shattuck, and the third, of Dr. George M. Sanders. Dr. Silvanus Morley's staff of workers rendered much aid, and considerable help was given also by Dr. Jerome O'F. Kilmartin of the U. S. Geological Survey. Part I. provides a historical, cultural, and physical background for the medical surveys and studies, which are found in Part II. (Chaps. VI-XXI). Part III. (Chaps. XXII-XXVI) consist of an account of clinics held in various parts of Yucatan; and part IV. (Chaps. XXVII-XXXIV) consists of contributions to the natural history of Yucatan. There are also two appendices—one a "List of reptiles collected in 1929 and 1930 at Chichen Itzá"; and the other "Protozoan and Helminthic Parasites of Reptiles, 1930".

There are also two good maps. The background chapters are naturally and perhaps necessarily short.

From the Fine Arts Press of Santa Ana, California, and under the direction of Mr. Thomas E. Williams, director of printing in Santa Ana Junior College, comes (1933) a rather unusual book. This is entitled *Chinigchinich*, and is "A Revised and Annotated Version of Alfred Robinson's Translation of Father Geronimo Boscana's historical Account of the Belief, Usages, Customs and Extravagencies of the Indians of this Mission of San Juan Capistrano called the Acagchemen Tribe". Robinson's first edition of this work, which was translated from a Spanish manuscript (for the book was not issued in Spanish) was published in 1846, under the title *Chinigchinich; o Historical Account of the Origin, Customs, and Traditions of the Indians of the Missionary Establishment of St. Juan. Capistrano, Alta California*. . . . The present volume was edited by Phil. Townsend Hanna, editor *Touring Topics*; the annotations are by John P. Harrington, of the Bureau of American Ethnology; Frederick Webb Hodge, director, Southwest Museum, supplies the foreword; and Jean Goodwin, of Santa Ana Junior College, furnishes the illustrations. Thus, the book comes well sponsored, and the result is a strikingly beautiful book, in which binding, colored illustrations, typography, and paper, all combine to produce a harmonious effect not too often seen. The result justifies Mr. Williams's contention that much valuable material is killed by the method of production. It is pleasing to record that the edition was sold almost as soon as it was off press. Many persons, in addition to those cited above, aided in this work (see pp. 92-93). Dr. Hodge's short introduction is interesting and valuable for the Indians of the region about San Juan Capistrano; and he speaks with authority. Dr. Harrington has annotated the text in great detail (pp. 96-228) and throws light on many matters. There is a good bibliography, but no index, which is the only major defect in the work. On p. 98, the name "Robertson" is undoubtedly intended for "Robinson". One may question the dropping of the accent in Spanish words ending in "ón", "in consistence with a systematic attempt to unburden Spanish orthography of useless accents" (p. 100). But with these omissions and commissions, the scholar and the craftsman have combined to produce a real book. Mr. Robinson's

translation of an old chronicle has been rescued from obscurity at the proper time. While to a considerable extent local, Hodge's foreword and Harrington's notes lift the volume out of the purely local and make the work a contribution to our knowledge of the Amerind.

The Pan American Union published in June, 1933 a revision of its Bibliographic Series, No. 5 (first published, July, 1931). The first edition contains 52 pages, the second, 113. The publication is entitled: "Theses on Pan American Topics prepared by Candidates for Degrees in Universities and Colleges in the United States", and it was compiled in the Columbian Memorial Library under direction of Charles E. Babcock, the librarian. Both published and unpublished theses are listed. The increase in the second edition is remarkable. The first edition had 502 titles; the second 1,111. The list is arranged in three sections: 1, alphabetically by authors, preceded by an identifying number; 2, an index by subjects with cross references; 3, a list of universities and colleges reporting. Though there are no present plans for making a third edition, "if the future discloses a need for lists of additional theses, such lists may be prepared as supplements". The universities having the greatest number of theses are in order California, Chicago, Clark, Columbia, Illinois, Stanford, and Texas. The list is very useful and it is hoped that additional lists will from time to time be compiled.

Jeffery W. Potter, town clerk of South Kingstown, Rhode Island, has published through The Providence Press of Snow & Farnham Co., of Providence, Rhode Island, a narrative poem entitled *Columbus: Discovery and Settlement of the Western World by Europeans* (pp. 179, paper covers, 1933). In his short preface, the author says "His labor has not been prompted by hope of liberal pecuniary reward, but rather by desire to do his share in perpetuating and promoting reverence for the bold navigators who dared supposedly untraversed seas, the heroes who bled in encountering the perils of a wild country with still wilder savages, and the sages who met and mastered difficulties and problems shrunk from or at best unsolved elsewhere". The volume has ten chapters each with a short argument, the last chapter being the "Burial of Columbus". The narrative is written in indifferent couplets. An ideal Columbus unknown to history results.

Alfred Batson, a Canadian journalist, in *Vagabond's Paradise* (Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1931, pp. [vi], 281) tells in a very interesting narrative form his rather hazardous adventures in Central America and Mexico, tramping (through force of circumstances), stealing rides, meeting other derelicts from the north, and many types of Central Americans and Mexicans, most of them generous and hospitable, but a few suspicious and hostile. There are many good descriptions of the country, and the author runs across the spur of such princely vagabonds as Lee Christmas and others not so widely known. The adventures are told frankly and so have a certain value as the record of a rather unusual experience. However, as one reads the story, he can not help feeling that both the United States and Canada need representatives in Hispanic America who do not have to "bum" their way through the various countries, living on their wits. Undoubtedly, Mr. Batson from his sufferings, and they were real, has "a pleasant tale to tell"; and he has probably come through his experiences with a keener sense of values, and perhaps greater sympathy.

The deliberations of the League of Nations with regard to the dispute between Colombia and Peru appears in the minutes of the public meeting held on Thursday, May 25, 1933. Notices of the dispute are found in *The Monthly Summary of the League of Nations* for January, February, March ("Adoption by the Council of the Report on the Dispute between Colombia and Peru"), April, May "Settlement of the Dispute between Colombia and Peru"), and June, 1933. The dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay is also discussed in these summaries.

The Librería "Cervantes" de Julio Suárez, Buenos Aires, has published (1933) the first volume of a *Catálogo de Libros Americanos*. The list of titles offered for sale is preceded by a preliminary note by Dr. Emilio Ravignani, director of the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. The list includes titles from A-K inclusive, in all 3,277 titles. Many of the titles are modern, but there is a good sprinkling of early books that are seldom found for sale. The prices appear moderate. Most of the titles are Spanish, but a few are in English; and most, but not all, treat of Argentina. Dr. Ravignani's introduction contains data of interest.

Mrs. Grace Thompson Seton in her *Magic Waters* (E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., N. Y., 1933, pp. 281, \$3.75) describes her experiences as a member of a scientific expedition to Brazil and Paraguay and travel alone into Paraguay, Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia, Peru, Chile, and Panama. The volume is interesting, but not uniformly so, and some of the descriptions are excellent and sprightly. One questions the good taste of the author in allowing her dislike of the other woman member of the scientific expedition to obtrude itself through the pages of her book; as well as the numerous illustrations in which the author appears. However, this might be excused on the ground that the narrative of the trip "Through the wilds of Matto Grosso and beyond" is an "autobiographical log".

It is a pity, however, that Mrs. Seton did not learn to distinguish between Brazil as a country of Portuguese origin and those of Spanish origin. It is rather surprising to be informed (p. 29) that "not in Rio can one see the high-class women of Spanish South America: the great great grand daughters of old Castile are further south". Morning and evening papers in Rio (p. 30) indulged in many "Spanish encomiendas" on her. Again, she appears unaware that Portuguese is spoken in Brazil (p. 42), when she says "my Spanish is defective". Other errors occur, as for instance, "Orellaña" for "Orellana"; "Asunçion" for "Asunción"; she evidently did not know that before the wife of the viceroy Chinchon (p. 32) gave quinine to the world, it had been known to the Jesuits and was long called by the name of "Jesuit or Peruvian bark". Also she gives (p. 144) the impression that Domingo [Martínez] de Irala and the dictator Dr. Francia were close together in time. A redundant comma on p. 150 makes "yerba mate" two substances. The book deserves an index but has none. Mrs. Seton has evidently been impelled by the desire "strange things to see" and has had little or no timidity of venturing into new scenes alone. The volume has nothing for the historian.